

ENGLISH STUDIES

EDITED BY

E. KRUISINGA, P. J. H. O. SCHUT AND R. W. ZANDVOORT

1922

VOLUME FOUR

4-6
1922-24

▬ NOS 1-6 ▬

PUBLISHED BY MESSRS. SWETS & ZEITLINGER, AMSTERDAM

REPRINTED BY VRB GRONINGEN (HOLLAND)

CONTENTS.

E55

ARTICLES.

v. 4-6 Page

W. VAN DOORN,	Fruit from the Golden Bough	81.
J. DE GRUYTER,	Shelley and Dostoievsky	129.
M. E. KAWA,	The Women of George Eliot's Novels 185,	217.
J. KOOISTRA,	The Pan-erotic Element in Shelley	171.
DR. E. B. KOSTER,	Lewis Theobald	20, 49.
A. G. VAN KRANENDONK,	Notes on Methods of Narration in some English Novels	1.
DR. E. KRUISINGA,	Contributions to English Syntax	19.
DR. F. P. H. PRICK VAN WELY,	War Words and Peace Pipings	10, 60.
M. S. SERJEANTSON,	The Dialectal Distribution of certain Phono- logical Features in Middle English 93, 191,	223.
DR. A. VERWEY,	<i>Alastor</i> , translated into Dutch	152.

REVIEWS.

W. VAN DOORN,	A Study in Realism	37.
— ,	The Realm of Poetry (Brown)	40.
— ,	The Sacred Wood (Eliot)	42.
— ,	Epilegomena to the Study of Greek Religion (Harrison)	43.
— ,	The English School of Lutenist Song-writers (Fellowes)	211.
— ,	The Poetry of John Dryden (van Doren)	212.
— ,	John Dryden and a British Academy (Emerson)	212.
— ,	An Essay towards a Theory of Art (Aber- crombie)	241.
— ,	The Chapbook, 22—30	243.
DR. E. B. KOSTER,	Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates (Pollard)	120.
A. G. VAN KRANENDONK,	Six Short Plays (Galsworthy)	74.
— ,	A New Shakespeare Edition (Quiller Couch and Dover Wilson)	121.
— ,	Die Englische Litteratur der Neuesten Zeit (Kellner)	122.
DR. E. KRUISINGA,	Mood and Tense (Poutsma)	75.
— ,	Handbook of Present-Day English, II ³ (Kruisinga)	75.
— ,	The Year's Work in English Studies, 1919- 1920 (Sidney Lee)	75.

PROF. S. B. LILJEGREN,	La Pensée de Milton (Saurat) ¹⁾	70, 119.
W. VAN MAANEN,	Vanessa and her Correspondence with Swift (Freeman)	71.
DR. F. P. H. PRICK VAN WELY,	A Dictionary of Military Terms (Farrow)	125.
PROF. DR. J. PRINSEN J. LZN,	Giovanni Florio (Longworth Chambrun)	239.
PROF. DR. N. VAN WIJK,	Language, its nature, development and origin (Jespersen)	208.
R. W. ZANDVOORT,	Byron (de Reul)	72.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Translations	33, 65, 115, 205, 235.
Translation M. O. 1922	198.
Notes and News.	

J. L. Cardozo, A Holiday at Stratford-on-Avon, 109; W. A. Ovaas, Dekker and *The Virgin Martyr*, 113; J. Veldkamp, A Pilgrimage to the Remains of Shelley and Keats, 200.
 Editorial, 234; English Association in Holland, 32, 65, 113, 201, 234;
 Philological Quarterly, 32; Max Kaluza †, 33; Report A-Examination
 1921, 33; B-Examination 1921, 114; Shelley Centenary Number,
 115; English studies at Groningen, 202; Morsbach's Successor,
 204; Modern Studies in Germany, 234.

Brief Mentions	76, 77, 127, 214.
Bibliographies	44, 77, 128, 215, 245.
Shelley-Bibliography (1908—1922)	177.

¹⁾ Cf. Vol. III, 180.

Notes on Methods of Narration in some English Novels.

In W. H. Hudson's excellent *Introduction to the Study of Literature* we find a sentence which indirectly reveals the difficulty of giving a satisfactory definition of the novel.

'A novel', he says in a chapter on prose fiction, 'whatever else it is or is not, is at any rate a story'. This meagre, prudent statement may seem a truism, and we can indeed hardly imagine a definition of the novel that could ignore the element of story-telling altogether, and yet this seemingly vital element has of late years more and more dropped into the background. Criticism is almost universally concerned with the 'whatever else' and the novelists themselves seem to neglect the technical management of their plots or what comes perhaps nearer to the truth: they are striving to reform the old time-honoured narrative technique. For the apparent disparagement of careful plot construction is not an independent phenomenon in the history of novel-writing. It is only the outward, easily discernible aspect so to say of a far deeper and far more important development. The interest in epic literature has undergone a complete change. What was originally the chief attraction for the hearers or readers of a romance: the strange adventures, the tension of the intrigue being kept up to the last moment, the hero's splendid behaviour and superhuman deeds, is now no longer necessary, rather it is usually detrimental to the success of epic art. We do not in the first place expect from the artist power of invention, of plot-building, of creating thrilling situations, but we do expect from him that he shall show the nicest psychological discernment, the all-important power to create character; we are no longer satisfied with a naïve distribution of rewards to the virtuous and punishments to the bad, we want to see in the novel a deeper philosophy revealed, a sincerer and more original view of life.

The change has been admirably typified by Professor W. Raleigh's witty contrast between two extremes of epic art: a minstrel's song and the work of Henry James. 'If a mediaeval minstrel', he says in *The English Novel*, 'had been requested to embody all the novels of Mr. H. James in his narrative, he would have put them into a single line:

— When twenty years were come and gone —
and hurried on to the next giant.'

But these 'storms in teacups' as Henry James's novels have been called, which a minstrel and his audience would treat with amazed contempt, engross us and satisfy our artistic sense, whereas the giants and their offspring, the romantic heroes, the paragons of virtue, the monsters of vice and all their thrilling blood-curdling adventures have been banished from the domain of serious literature and relegated to the limbo of the cinema.

From the middle ages onward there has been a gradual awakening to a sense of fact, a process which was suddenly intensified and accelerated in the middle of the 19th century. This mental growth, engendering a more sceptical attitude on the part of the audience, has made the task of the story-teller ever so much more difficult.

No artistic appreciation, no enjoyment of a tale is possible without a temporary belief in its reality. The reader of a novel, the listener to a romance unconsciously begins with an act of surrender. He subdues his will, he switches off as it were the current of the thoughts, impressions, joys, sorrows, hopes, fears that constitute his own daily life, to live for some time

with the greatest possible concentration in the imaginary world the artist creates for him. And he is quite willing to do so. No less nowadays than in the Middle Ages. Only it was probably much easier for the minstrel's audience to make the act of surrender, to enter heart and soul into the magic domain. We moderns have become less imaginative, less credulous, incomparably more fastidious and critical. The least little shock of improbability or inconsistency makes us wake up with a start from the spell under which we had willingly allowed the artist to put us. If these shocks are repeated, they soon prove fatal to the success of the work of art. The novelist has failed in what should be his first object: to make us believe in the reality of his creation.

Success or failure in this respect depend of course upon a complex variety of factors all closely interrelated. When for convenience sake we try to detach a few of the more marked, we shall find that by far the most important are the author's power of creating character and the depth, sincerity and originality of his interpretation of life.

Descriptive passages, the felicitous choice of characteristic detail by which the outward appearance of the personages and their surroundings flashes as if by magic before the mind's eye, may also greatly contribute to the coveted illusion of reality.

And lastly then we think of the method of narrating, the manner and order in which the author — consciously or unconsciously — has chosen to present his subject-matter.

As might have been expected, the change in the nature and the chief object of the novel has involved a change in this more purely technical element as well. Nothing seems more natural. Yet it is a fact, that the first signs of a change in this particular respect have been remarkably long delayed. By the time when the interest of the foremost novelists and their readers had almost exclusively concentrated itself on creation of character and truth to life, we find these writers still using the same methods of narration as their brothers-in-art — predecessors and contemporaries — who depended for success mainly on their skill of inventing surprising adventures and keeping the readers in suspense by intricate and clever intrigues. On the whole this similarity of method has detracted but little from the merit of the work of art, yet there are cases in which it has decidedly played the author tricks. A device successful in a story of adventure may fall flat or even do positive harm in a psychological novel, and thoughtless imitation has often led a writer to applying it in passages, where it was quite out of place. A few examples from well-known books may make our meaning clearer.

The Devil's Garden by W. B. Maxwell is a novel which without opening up new vistas of thought, without revealing great originality or a profound vision of life, is saved from mediocrity by excellent descriptions, very good characterisation and a powerful, interesting story which holds the reader from the beginning. There is, however, one flaw in the construction of the plot, a flaw which having probably arisen from the desire to lead up to a strong final effect, shows how the old devices of the story of intrigue may impair a complete realisation of character in a psychological novel.

The hero, Mr. Dale, postmaster in a small town, has been shamefully ill-treated by the squire. One day when Dale is said to be in London on business, the squire who had gone out riding alone, is found dead. Apparently the horse, known as a spirited and dangerous animal, has thrown its rider on the rocky ground. All the circumstances point to this and the coroner's inquest immediately results in a verdict of accidental death.

The fatal event has a far-reaching influence on the lives of the chief personages and the story proceeds accordingly, until towards the end we are suddenly told the real cause of the squire's death. The postmaster had murdered him under circumstances of such extreme provocation as to make the deed almost excusable. That this vital fact is withheld from the reader so long has a disturbing effect; it blurs the impression he had received of the hero's personality. A trained reader of romance might have had an inkling of the facts from the outset, he could not be sure; he was purposely left in the dark until the truth was sprung upon him as a surprise. Such a tardy revelation of a most important event may do very well in a story of adventure, in a book like this, where our attention is chiefly directed to the character-description, we feel tricked, deceived. For now that the secret has been divulged to us, the behaviour of Dale on previous occasions appears in a very different light. We want to reread the story, to revise our impression of the hero's character, we feel that in many details the mental image we had formed of his personality will prove to have been a false one. The author himself has apparently felt this, for after the revelation he recapitulates in a few words the past incidents in the form of reflexions of Dale, a makeshift which cannot adequately restore the disturbed unity and clearness of the character-description.

The interests of psychology have here to a certain extent been sacrificed to the interests of suspense, surprise and a strong dramatic climax.

Another old device to excite the reader's curiosity and to keep his interest in a story awake, is to refer in a few casual words to important events before they are actually told. We find e. g. Stevenson use it to excellent purpose in *Treasure Island*. When the captain disapproves of the generosity of the squire who had put a barrel of apples on deck for any one to help himself that had a fancy, and he says he had never known good come of such kindness, Jim, the narrator, continues: 'But good did come of the apple barrel as you shall hear, for if it had not been for that, we should have had no note of warning and might all have perished by the hand of treachery'. Again, when he tells how he — Jim — goes on shore alone with the pirates, he is careful to add, that this mad impulse will afterwards prove to have been one of the causes of his friends' rescue.

Such hints at coming events, thrown out as if quite casually, may be very effective in a lively narrative of adventure, because the reader's attention is there chiefly directed to the course of events. But when used in a novel in which the creation and development of character has been the writer's main concern, the device may have a disturbing and even an irritating effect.

Frank Swinnerton — who wrote a book on Stevenson — occasionally uses this device in *The Chaste Wife*, a novel of his first period, when he had not yet attained the perfect craftsmanship he afterwards displayed in *Nocturne*. In one place e. g. he breaks off an interesting character sketch with the bald statement: 'The story of his friendship with Minnie is a part of this tale and will appear in its due course'. But the reader badly wants to know this story to complete his impression of the man's character; he was beginning to understand him, to feel, to live with him and now the author suddenly interrupts this process and tries to play upon his curiosity. The promise is here moreover so awkwardly worded that the unlucky sentence really constitutes a double fault.

As is well known, we may distinguish three methods of narration: the direct or epic, the autobiographical and the documentary. 'In the first and most usual way' — I am quoting here from Hudson — 'the novelist is an

historian narrating from the outside; in the second he writes in the first person, in the third, the action is unfolded by means of letters, diaries etc.'

When using the first method — as Swinnerton does in *The Chaste Wife* — the author assumes omniscience. This has the advantage of assuring a smooth and easy flow of the narrative, but there is a slight drawback. Omniscience may be very convenient, no one can lay claim to it in real life and so its assumption causes an element of untruth to enter into the story from the beginning. There is always a tacit understanding that the reader shall overlook this one impossibility, and indeed it is not very difficult for him to do so. As a rule he will remain perfectly unconscious of having connived at a bold and false assumption on the part of the narrator. But then the author should never abuse of the privilege granted to him. He must hide the incriminating fact, keep his own person as omniscient narrator in the background, let the story tell itself, so to say. If he does not, if he steps too boldly into the stream of the story, showing abruptly that it is he, the almighty creator, who really directs its course, the reader's illusion of reality suffers a severe shock. And the more critical the age for which a novelist writes, the more serious the consequences of this apparently innocent mistake will of course become.

A sentence as the one quoted above, loudly proclaiming the author's directing power and at the same time betraying the clumsiness of his narrative technique, will not be found in his maturer work.

In this case the author has made too free with the privilege of omniscience which is part and parcel of the direct method of narration. He has been too bold. He must not be too diffident either. Suppose a writer has described a lady reading a letter. As we all remember, he will sometimes go on sweetly: If we could have looked over her shoulder, we should have seen that this letter etc. But this is insincere. By adopting the method of direct narrative the author had gained a right, the precious privilege of knowing everything he should want to know. The reader had silently consented to overlook the impossibility involved. And now the writer shams ignorance of the compact and by doing so he again needlessly reminds his reader of the fact, that in reality he could never know all the things he still must needs tell. Fortunately this childish attitude is now seldom found outside third-rate fiction.

It has frequently been pointed out that Thackeray was a sinner against the spirit of the direct narrative form, notably in *Vanity Fair*. Indeed there is hardly a chapter or a passage even of that famous book, in which he does not interrupt the action, stepping in personally to comment, to criticise, to meet imaginary objections on the part of the reader, to tell him that his characters are but puppets, that he the author is the inventor and ruler of them all. Yet *Vanity Fair* is one of the acknowledged masterpieces of fiction. But this does not necessarily mean that its method of narration is beyond blame. At most it proves once more that the gift of characterisation is always by far the most important desideratum for a novelist and that a genius may triumph over unfortunate peculiarities of technique which, if indulged in by a lesser man, would very probably mean his undoing as an artist. Furthermore it must not be forgotten that besides being a brilliant psychological novel, *Vanity Fair* is a social satire. From the beginning we are conscious of moving in an atmosphere of irony. The personages, true to life and individualized though they may be, are at the same time seen as types representing groups from a certain part of the society of the times. As such they do come nearer to that qualification of puppets the author

chose to apply to them, than if they had been meant as individuals pure and simple. They are always played with in a spirit of gentle irony, there is always behind the creation of character and action the desire to satirize, in these social types, social conditions and events. Such a novel must needs contain a strong personal element; its story can stand some meddling and interrupting. That the author takes away our belief in the reality of his fictitious world 'an und für sich' is not so serious here, because the suggestion of this illusion was not his chief object. We may become conscious of the fact that the personages are but puppets at the mercy of their creator, if only we are always convinced that they faithfully represent the classes of society he wants to satirize. Whether after all this end might not have been attained without the author's more or less disturbing personal comment, whether the indirect dramatic method of characterisation would not have served the purpose and secured a higher artistic unity, is another question which we cannot attempt to answer here. ¹⁾

But we have here touched on an important point: the obvious fact, to which we already alluded, that between the artist's aim, the subject matter, the general atmosphere of the work and his method of presentment there should be a close relationship, and that therefore we might expect to see the great change in the character of fiction accompanied by experiments in a new narrative technique, a technique subservient to the ever increasing desire of suggesting strict reality and truth to life.

In the latter part of the 19th century some novelists are becoming impatient of the machinery of the old complicated plot. A story perfectly complete in itself, a unit in spite of all its ramifications, with a promising beginning, a long elaborate middle leading up to a forcible crisis, a definite end, the whole told by an omniscient narrator, seemed unfit as a medium for their strictly realistic art, because in real life such complicated, yet perfectly balanced, well rounded and conclusive stories are practically unknown.

The change they made in the form of the novel was a radical one. The telling of an artistically complete story appearing impossible or difficult to couple with the coveted impression of reality, the easiest solution was not to tell a story at all. And something very near to this was attempted by the adherents of the theory of the 'tranche de vie'. The novel was to offer no more or no less than a 'slice of life', a phase of reality observed or experienced by the artist and rendered without any effort at introducing a regular intrigue, at building up a complete story leading to an impressive climax. A similar change soon affected the drama where the theory evinces itself especially in the unemphatic last act, in the care of the playwright to avoid an old-fashioned 'curtain'.

But the emancipation from the old expedients of narrative technique, the striving to eschew at all cost anything that might smack of artificiality, did not stop here. If the narrator of a more or less intricate story had been turned into a recorder of a simple phase of life, he had still retained the privilege of omniscience with its inherent unreality or impossibility.

Against this convenient, time-honoured practice some also turned their attacks. They began to favour the *I* form. They wrote purely autobiographical novels or caused the action to be revealed by a character not the author himself, but either the hero or a person who played a subsidiary part in the story, a device R. L. Stevenson had occasionally used and on which Mr. H. James in his later work so often relied.

¹⁾ It might be interesting to study in this respect the differences of technique in Thackeray's novels, to compare e. g. *Vanity Fair* with *Esmond*.

Whether the omniscient method really tends to disappear altogether, as Mr. Wilson Follett¹⁾ thinks, may be doubted, certain it is, that the *I* form is beginning to play a very important part in modern fiction.

A recent novel, in which the two tendencies indicated above are found combined, is the curious *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* by James Joyce. As the title suggests it is an avowed autobiography, and although written in the third person the expedient does not alter its character, as the 'he' is here to all intents and purposes a pure 'I'. It opens with the earliest recollections of childhood and is carried on to the years of his life as a student. But it is rather a series of impressions and incomplete recollections, a haphazard choice of incidents from the chain of events, than a regular story or full account of his youth. The author does not describe the past as he sees it from the viewpoint of his present consciousness, he tries to live back again in the old days and to render their peculiar essence as faithfully as possible without the least comment, with a complete elimination of the deeper insight afterwards gained. He makes the boy, his past ego, tell the story himself without help from his present wiser and more complicated personality.

The method secures an unusually strong suggestion of reality, but it has its disadvantages. Firstly the artist can hardly use it quite consistently; however sincerely he may strive to let the boy unfold his own mind, communicate his impressions in his own words, there are always occasions on which he must needs be aided in his utterance.

There is an inherent impossibility even in this seemingly so strictly realistic method of narration. And whenever the reader feels the artificiality beneath the apparently crude, spontaneous and natural expressions, whenever he feels too clearly, that it is after all only the grown-up man who speaks, the impression of sincerity and truth is impaired, not because he would grudge the artist his privilege of telling the story from his own point of view, but because the author had all along pretended that he would keep aloof and let the child, the boy, the student speak. A striking example is afforded by the description of Stephen's first Christmas dinner, where the author reports pages full of conversation on politics, religion and kindred subjects among the grown-up people at table, giving their exact words and the impression they make, a wealth of matter impossible for a boy to remember or to understand, too obviously carefully re-created by the artist from vague impressions. The inconsistency is accentuated by the fact that immediately afterwards the boy resumes his rights and unfolds his life from his own youthful, limited consciousness, as e.g.:

"He thought of the dark silent sacristy. There were dark wooden presses there, where the crimped surplices lay quietly folded. It was not the chapel but still you had to speak under your breath. It was a holy place. He remembered the summer evening he had been there to be dressed as boatbearer, the evening of the procession to the little altar in the wood. A strange and holy place. The boy that held the censer had swung it lifted by the middle chain to keep the coals lighting. That was called charcoal: and it had burned quietly as the fellow had swung it gently and had given off a weak sour smell. And then when all were vested he had stood holding out the boat to the rector and the rector had put a spoonful of incense in it and it had hissed on the red coals" etc.

How different is this excellent page from the long verbatim report of the Christmas conversations with which the boy's mind had hardly anything to do!

¹⁾ W. Follett, *The Modern Novel*. See *E. Studies* II, p. 55.

Yet this almost unavoidable inconsistency — a kind of technical double-dealing — constitutes after all but a minor blemish. The greater disadvantage of the method is the lack of form and unity, resulting not from negligence, but from the all-conquering desire to produce the effect of real life. The utter disregard of structure in *The Portrait* is noticeable from the beginning, but if the confusion, the formlessness of the narrative, are perhaps not improper in the rendering of the years of childhood, they become objectionable towards the end of the book.

After the reminiscences from the boy's early years there are two events in his school-life which stand out clearly from the rest: the undeserved punishment and the account of his sin and subsequent conversion; both are told more or less regularly as 'stories' in a more old-fashioned way and it is remarkable, that they form by far the best part of the book, although in the last-mentioned the monk's sermon on hell — an excellent, insinuatingly satirical piece in itself — is out of all proportion with the rest. But after this powerful and occasionally brilliant part, the book brings but some slight, loosely connected incidents and then dozens of pages of students' conversation, in which there are a few interesting remarks, but which on the whole are of the ordinary kind, not a wit better we fancy than those which years ago George du Maurier with wiser modesty and a nicer sense of proportion compressed into a few lines, as: "What jolly talk we had into the small hours! . . . Good, honest, innocent artless prattle — not of the wisest perhaps, nor redolent of the very highest culture, nor leading to any very practical result . . ." (*Trilby*).

And then after this redundancy of conversation we are suddenly for the first time granted some ten pages of rather obscure and insignificant jottings from the hero's diary.

Such amorphous structure can hardly be defended even in an autobiography; a little more art and less conversational matter would have done no harm to the impression of reality. The mistakes of thinking that photographic exactness in painting would be a form of realistic art or that a verbatim report of actually spoken words would be effective in conversational parts of a novel, have often been signalled. They find a parallel in Joyce's narrative technique. The desire to render the confusion, the incompleteness, that characterize events in real life, has betrayed him into an inartistic, slavish imitation.

It goes without saying that the dangers and disadvantages incident to a consistent adherence to the principle of the 'tranche de vie' are of even graver consequence outside the domain of real or fictitious autobiography. And as has been indicated by many critics, the reaction has gained considerable strength. The desire for some sort of unity and form has made itself clearly felt.

But the serious artist could of course not fall back upon the old method of elaborate plot construction, with its arbitrary use of incident and intrigue, without making attempts at improvement, at eliminating its inherent improbability and untruth. The victory of realism had been too decisive for such a resigned return. The anxiety to ensure strict life-likeness has remained as strong as ever and the problem for the novelist is how to combine this with the wish to attain a greater unity in his story than is possible by the mere slavish copying of the irregular, shapeless flow of incidents of real life.

Several modern artists have consciously or unconsciously tackled this problem. Without ever losing their dread of the unnatural, elaborate plot, they have been giving more attention to construction, to balance and harmony, as may already be inferred from such a trifling peculiarity as the careful

division into books', 'parts', 'sections', 'chapters', each usually with an adequate headline, which one often meets with nowadays. It is, however, especially two types of novel that testify to the renewed desire for a stricter unity. The first kind we mean is that in which the author traces the life of his hero from the very cradle to the grave or at any rate to an advanced and definitely closed epoch in his career. He writes a 'life' and however varied the hero's adventures, however many persons he may meet, the story never breaks up into a series of loosely connected incidents, everything is carefully subordinated to the single theme: the personality of the hero, the steady progress of his life, definitely rounded off by birth and death, which makes for a clearly perceptible unity, an artistically complete story. Of course this sort of novel is very old. But that of late it has found so many adherents is certainly noteworthy. In some cases the author has given such abundant detail, he has so minutely expounded the development of the hero's character as to cause his work to distend to inordinate length, so that two, three or even a whole series of volumes have become necessary, as for the classic example of this species: *Jean Christophe*.

A few other authors have sought for unity in a quite different direction. Simplification of theme and plot has been their watchword. The author treats a single episode or the events of a short period, some days, an evening, and limits his characters to a very few, thus making his novel in many respects resemble the short story. There is indeed but one important difference: this new kind of fiction — of which that little masterpiece: *Nocturne* may be cited as an almost perfect example — treats the scanty matter of the short story with a fulness of detail which gives it the length of a novel, a method well in keeping with the shifting of the interest from adventures to psychology and character description, from the mere outward happening to their impression and influence on the minds of the personages concerned.

The reaction against the principle of the 'tranche de vie', the instinctive aversion from the diffuseness to which it led, the desire for a complete story, have also caused a reconsideration of the potentialities of the more complicated plot for strictly realistic art. Some modern authors have as it were discovered that a more or less complex, carefully constructed story was after all not such a redoubtable enemy to an impression of lifelikeness and reality, that it was mainly the vague, ghostly, omniscient narrator with his external, undefinable viewpoint that had been at fault.

As Mr. Percy Lubbock in his very interesting, recently published book: *The Craft of Fiction*¹⁾ puts it: "In the fictitious picture of life the effect of validity is all in all and there can be no appeal to an external authority; and so there is an inherent weakness in it, if the mind that knows the story and the eye that sees it remain unaccountable. At any moment they may be questioned, and the only way to silence the question is somehow to make the mind and the eye objective, to make them facts in the story. When the point of view is definitely included in the book, when it can be recognized and verified there, then every side of the book is equally wrought and fashioned." Hence the predilection of so many modern authors for the *I* form or for the creation of a subsidiary character who unfolds the action.

Mr. Lubbock makes many penetrating observations on the 'means that a novelist will adopt to authenticate his story — to dramatise the seeing eye', as found in the work of Dickens, de Balzac, Stevenson, Henry James

¹⁾ P. Lubbock, *The Craft of Fiction*. London, Jonathan Cape, 1921. 277 pp. 9/—

and others. He does not mention Joseph Conrad. Yet this master-novelist whose importance is still too little recognized in, but especially outside, England, except perhaps in France, has gone furthest of all in this 'dramatizing of the viewpoint'.

When the novelist employs one of his characters to reveal the action he has indeed, by including the point of view in the story, by changing the vague external narrator, the almighty showman behind the scenes, into a visible comprehensible character, gained the great advantage of naturalness and authenticity, but the lack of omniscience of this new, concrete narrator often causes the author fresh difficulties. For this personage, who plays some part in the story, can make us see the character only from one side; some incidents, many motives must needs have remained unknown to him and can only be guessed at. So far as the hero is concerned the necessary, intimate knowledge may be very well supplied by a diary, to which the narrator in some way or other has had access, so that the method of direct narrative is then combined with the documentary, a device already used by older writers. Conrad has employed it with great effect in *Under Western Eyes*. In several other books he makes the story unfold itself through the consciousness of Marlow, a philosophically inclined man past middle age with manifold experience, but Conrad always takes care to supplement Marlow's own story by that of other witnesses, and Marlow makes his informants speak for themselves, so that we are shown the personages and events from other viewpoints too. In *Chance* he has used this method more consistently. The story is here built up as it were by several narrators working together, the majority of whom also play an active part in it themselves. Of course this intricate way of communicating the events to the reader has its disadvantage: the smooth easy flow of the narrative must occasionally be broken, an incident will be considered more than once out of its proper place in the sequence of events. But this drawback, which greatly increases the difficulties of the novelist as a story-teller, is more than outweighed by the possibilities it procures for him of ensuring an almost perfect suggestion of reality. The incidents are shown under various aspects, coloured and illuminated, shaded and toned down by the different personalities of the narrators, so that they stand out in strong relief and a strikingly natural atmosphere is created round them. These narrators have not remained mere vague mouthpieces, we see and know them as we do acquaintances in real life, they reveal themselves and each other by their words, actions, interrelations and they have also some influence on the chief figures of the novel, whom accordingly we get to know not from the onesided account of one particular person, but from the recorded impressions of divers clearly drawn individuals, each of whom gives his own characteristic colouring to the heroes' deeds and adds details unknown to the others.

By this complicated method — which we must not forget very closely resembles the way in which we get to know people in real life — the personages are so to say not seen flat against a background, they are seen from a variety of positions, plastic, in the midst of a clearly perceptible atmosphere. Conrad himself has said it should be the ideal of fiction to aspire to the plasticity of sculpture and in *Chance* and several other books he has certainly attained remarkable results in this direction. It would be foolish to think, that this is entirely due to matters of technique: we need hardly repeat, that the mysterious gift of creating character, the power of understanding and describing the most diversified individuals, is of

incomparably greater importance than any technical device, but that the method of presentment has something to do with the success achieved in the creation of an intense impression of reality, and that it is therefore worth while studying the new experiments in the art of novel-writing, can hardly be denied.

A. G. VAN KRANENDONK.

War Words and Peace Pipings.

(Materials for a Study in Slang and Neologism.)

According to plan, in accordance with plan, English rendering of the German word *planmässig*, well-known from the translations of the *Tagesberichte* announcing some retreat or retrograde movement — used in a wider sense now, as appears from the following quotations :

This is a farce "according to plan". But the plan is of a distinctly old-fashioned and familiar order. Hustle and bustle, hurry and scurry, equivocation and recrimination, errant husbands and suspicious wives, a more than usually liberal supply of doors and tables, and a general sense of unreality — these, mainly, are the elements out of which "A Week-end" is fashioned. (*Daily Tel.*, 13 Sept. 1918.)

It gives one the impression of being written not "according to plan" but out of a random fancy, with so hurried a pen that not merely have irrelevant incidents, absurdities of diction, and indubitable *longueurs* escaped excision, but such lapses from the King's fair English as "save you and I" and "I shoot with my own hand he who refuses". (*Punch*, 24 Oct. 1917.)

acceptance officer, an officer in the Air Force who takes delivery of flying machines forwarded by the factories :

From the day it is born, delivered new, fresh, and glistening from the maker's works to the critical care of the "acceptance" officer, until the end of its life — perhaps still new, fresh, and glistening, a "crash" on the aerodrome — every minute of the aeroplane's life is recorded in a little brown-covered book, the "Aeroplane Logbook". (*Daily Mail*, 19 June 1918.)

ace, the rank given to an airman, when he has destroyed five enemies (E. S. Farrow, *Dict. of Mil. Terms*). This is an adaptation of the French word *as*, which means : 1 *havresac*; 2 *cavalier du premier peloton*; 3 *aviateur virtuose* (A. Dauzat, *L'argot de la guerre*, p. 242). In the latter meaning it has passed into English, the *ace of aces* corresponding to the French *superas*. As to the origin of the term I may quote G. Esnault, *Le Poilu tel qu'il se parle*, p. 47 : "notre métaphore n'est pas issue des jeux de cartes où l'as est de valeur très variable, mais du jeu de dés où il vaut toujours l'unité ; c'est l'idée de numérotation qui est essentielle, la métaphore est une métaphore d'ordre". Though written in 1918, Mr. Farrow's book is not up to date, in support of which assertion I can quote again from Esnault's *Le Poilu*, where it says on p. 45 : "Le pilote qui avoit abattu cinq Boches était déclaré "as" jusqu'à la fin de 1917, où le commandement décida de réserver ce nom aux "chasseurs" qui auraient dix pièces à leur actif". Mr. Farrow ought to have written : five or more, as does the *Daily Telegraph* correspondent in the following paragraph about the Allied Air Supremacy (18 Dec. 1918) :

BRITISH "ACES" FIRST.

From Our Own Correspondent.

NEW YORK, Monday. — Figures compiled by Mr. Laurance Driggs, from Governmental records, and published in his "Heroes of Navigation", give some idea of the magnitude

of the score in the air for the first four years of the war. The total number of Germans brought down by the Allies can only be guessed at, because Mr. Driggs deals merely with the performances of the aces — men with five or more victories to their credit — but the score must be large, because 227 Allied aces obtained 2,895 victories.

The author pays a glowing tribute to the heroism of the British flyers, and proves by cold statistics that your men led the world in aerial feats. Britain's 111 aces scored 1,629 victories, compared with the nearest rival, France, with a record of 77 aces and 847 victories; Italy, 14 and 193; the United States, 14 and 121; Belgium, 8 and 77; Russia, 3 and 28.

For *ace of aces* see the following quotations :

If you can keep all that in mind you will understand something of what skill goes to the making of "an ace of aces", a destroyer of many German planes, and you will see that Jack Bull has a good deal to learn in his six weeks at the Armament School. (*Daily Tel.*, 27 Sept. 1918.)

Cp. also the following heading from the *Daily Tel.*, 20 Sept. 1918 :

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL W. A. BISHOP, V.C., D.S.O., M.C., D.F.C.

THE "ACE OF ALL THE ACES" WRITES AS WELL AS HE FIGHTS. HIS BOOK
WINGED WARFARE.

ac emma, A.M. = 1 ante meridiem; 2 air-mechanic :

After a bit 'e comes out an' tells me to come on wi' him up to the Observation Post. This was about eight ac emma [A.M.], an' just gettin' light enough to see (Boyd Cable, *Between the Lines*, p. 260).

acrobacy class, explained in the following quotation :

After getting through with this we went to the acrobacy class, as distinguished from the spiral class. Here we were given thirteen-meter machines — about fifteen feet wide — to fly. These seemed much smaller than the fifteen-meter planes and were known as Baby Nieuports. They were of eighty horse power and not particularly fast — capable of doing about ninety miles an hour. (*Sunday Pictorial*, 15 June, p. 18.)

Action Front, the title of a now famous war-book, is an artillery word of command to a battery preparing for action. The term *action* (without either front or rear) is commonly used in artillery exercise when guns are brought into or change position. The word *action* is used in another sense in the phrase *for necessary action forthwith*, for which see the following quotation from *London Opinion*, 3 Dec. 1921 :

Mr. George Robey is endeavouring to obtain an option on the Army copyright of the phrases "Passed to you, please", and "For necessary action forthwith", for use in pantomime.

adopter, who adopts a war prisoner :

"ADOPTERS" WANTED.

When prisoners are placed on the fund an "adopter" is sought. An adopter is a patriot who is willing to subscribe 5s. weekly, and thus become responsible for the welfare of a particular prisoner. Sometimes the adopter is able to take over several prisoners, sometimes several persons join together to supply one prisoner. In this way *The Evening News* Prisoners of War Fund has arranged the adoption of 620 of the prisoners it has taken over. There are, however, a number — 384, to be precise — who at the moment of writing are unadopted. (*Daily Mail*, 9 May 1916.)

aerial, substantive, the antenna-like collecting wire in wireless telegraphy, from *aerial wire*, another name for the air-wire. In our dictionaries the word occurs but as an adjective only = of air, gaseous; ethereal; existing, found, etc. in the air. As a noun it is to be found in Cassell's *Engl. Dict.* (1919). As early as July 25th 1914 it occurs as such in *The Times* :

Before he could send another message, part of the Marconi house was blown in and came right on top of him. The Marconi "aerial" was also blown in. He got out and saw the captain outside, and he told him to send out the "S.O.S.". Witness told him that the "aerial" had been blown away, and asked him if there was time to rig up another. The captain said "No, you had better get into the boat".

aerial destroyer, a super-fighting 'plane :

NEW "AERIAL DESTROYER" BEATS BEST R. A. F. MACHINE.

A new monoplane "aerial destroyer" was demonstrated against the standard fighting aeroplane of the Royal Air Force — Bristol Fighter (a 2-seater biplane) — in the presence of the British Air Minister, Capt. F. E. Guest, and members of the Air Ministry at Northolt Aerodrome, Middlesex. (*W. Daily Mail*, 22 Oct., 1921).

aerial port, another word for *air-port*, q. v.

aerial sickness, a sickness affecting aëronauts, due to high speed of flights and rapidity in changing altitudes, combining symptoms of mountain sickness and of seasickness; also, a somewhat similar sickness caused by the rolling and pitching of an aircraft, especially by that of an aeroplane (Webster, *Dict.*).

aerial skid, see quotation :

The art of "Aerobatics" . . . has become a necessity in modern aerial warfare. Looping, stalling, nose-diving and similar tricks all have their special use to a resourceful pilot in a tight corner . . . The "aerial skid" is, perhaps, the most interesting "stunt" of the lot. It is said to have been originated by pilots of Albatros "Chasers". E is being attacked from behind by a fast fighter F. The pilot of E, in order to avoid the fire from F, swings his rudder hard round to the right, and simultaneously lowers his right "aileron". This causes his machine to swing round on a pivot in an exactly similar manner to a motor car skidding on a slippery surface. (*Graphic*, 24 Nov. 1917).

aerial smoker, see quotation :

Aerial "smokers" are the latest feature of aeroplane construction for the London-Continental service. Specially placed smoking compartments are under consideration, with floors, walls, and roofs of fire-resisting material. (*W. Daily Mail*, 29 Oct., 1921).

aerial torpedo, a large winged bomb for aircraft use, designed to obtain the greatest weight with the smallest cross-section so as to reduce air resistance (Cassell's *Engl. Dict.*).

aero, an aëroplane, airship :

Then it's up for a run, and it's down into cover,
With the ping of his bullet and bang of my rifle,
And the whir of the range-finding aëros that hover,
As shy of a gun as the shyest old plover,
A snatch of a ditty, some music-hall trifle —

(*Answers*, 11 Dec., 1915).

aerobatics, see *aerial skid*.**aeroboat, a flying boat (Webster, *Dict.*).****aerobomb, an airbomb (*Daily Chronicle*, 1914.)****aerobus, slang for *aeroplane* (*Pocket Oxford Dict.*)¹**

aero-camera, a special form of camera used vertically for photographing the ground from an aeroplane or other aircraft. (Cassell's *Dict.*).

aerodonetics, the name given to the science of soaring or gliding flight (E. S. Farrow, *Dict. of Mil. Terms*).

aerodrome, a course or area for racing by flying-machines.

aerodynamical, belonging to aerodynamics or the science which treats of the force exerted by gases in motion.

aero-engine, a flying machine :

Mr. Handley Page was appointed vendor of this stock, which consisted of about 10,000 war aeroplanes, 35,000 aero engines, immense stocks of spares, and a large number of hangars (Hazell's *Annual* 1920, p. 720).

¹) Not yet published.

aerofoil, a kind of attachment to a flying-machine in the shape of an arched surface :

The first-named [i.e. the Handley Page] in its present early form is an attachment of a very narrow aerofoil near the leading edge of the plane and extending from wing-tip to wing-tip (Hazell's *Annual*, 1920, p. 719).

aerogram, a message sent by wireless (Cassell's *Engl. Dict.*).

aerogun, an anti-aircraft gun (Cassell's *Engl. Dict.*).

aerohydroplane, a flying boat (*Pocket Oxford Dict.*).

aeromechanic, a mechanic expert in the art and practice of aeronautics (Webster, *Dict.*).

aeroplane neck, see quotation from the *Sunday Pictorial*, 28 May, 1916 :
EVER HAD AEROPLANE NECK ?

Another war complaint from which civilians sometimes suffer is known among medicos as "aeroplane neck". It is contracted, of course, through gazing up into the ether for long periods at shiny, whirling specks.

aeroplanist, a flier who uses an aeroplane (*Engl. Rev.*, 1914).

aeroshed, a hangar for aeroplanes.

aerostamp, a stamp for letters sent by air-mail.

after-care, see quotation, an advertisement from *The Times*, 4 May, 1917 :
WHAT IS AFTER-CARE ?

When a blinded man leaves St. Dunstan's Hostel he has been trained to a useful occupation. A blinded worker, however expertly trained, however competent, still cannot compete with his sighted comrades on equal terms. The After-Care Branch, then, endeavours to reduce to a minimum the blinded man's handicap. The blind worker's plant and raw material are bought for him at a fair price; he is helped to keep abreast of up-to-date improvements; and in every way possible continuity of employment is secured for him. To do this with complete thoroughness is costly, and the whole object of St. Dunstan's great Bazaar is to swell the After-Care Fund and to place it upon a permanent and satisfactory basis. (*Times*, 4 May, 1917).

agony-waggon, see quotation from *The Daily Mail*, 24 Sept., 1918 :

When she took the dressing, the trolly bearing the medicaments and appliances well deserved its nick-name of "the agony-wagon." Her not unskilful hands had no soothing power in them. The glow of sympathy was absent.

aid-post, a post where first medical aid is administered to wounded soldiers :

The doctors selected their regimental aid-posts, where first aid is administered to the wounded. (G. V. Williams, *With our Army in Flanders*, p. 54).

aileron, an auxiliary plane, flap or wing tip, placed near the extremity of the main wing on either side and operating so as to prevent overturning sideways and to assist in steering (E. S. Farrow, *Dict. of Mil. Terms*).

air-base, a place used as a base of operations or for the housing of aircraft (Cassell's *Engl. Dict.*).

air-bomb, a bomb dropped from aircraft.

air-board, see quotation :

It is stated that the Air-Board now consists of the Chairman, Lord Cowdray, who will presumably become Air Minister when the Board becomes a Ministry; two representatives of the R. F. C.; two representatives of the R. N. A. S.; two representatives of the Ministry of Munitions; a Technical Director; and a Parliamentary Secretary (*Times*, 5 Jan., 1917).

air-bump, an air-disturbance causing a flying machine to bump :

Lieut. Chater did not give evidence and Mr. Mellor pointed out that the jury had heard nothing to convince them that what happened was due to gross negligence. He

suggested that an "air bump" might cause the machine to drop lower than was intended. Lieut. Chater was only 18½ years old, and had done only about four months flying. Mr. Mellor expressed the deep regret of Lieut. Chater at the fatality. (*Daily Mail*, 29 March, 1919).

air campaign, a campaign in which aircraft are used:

The general plan of the air campaign was prepared under the directions of the Air Staff (Hazell's *Annual*, 1920, p. 720).

air-candidate, see quotation:

The idea of an "air candidate" for Parliament to advocate an air policy for the defence of London seems already to have caught on.

Letters and telegrams of congratulation and good wishes poured in. After a busy morning he received a deputation from Mile End, who went away smiling and gratified.

Mr. Pemberton-Billing in his address says his object is to obtain for his country a strong fighting policy in the air. (*Daily Mirror*, 15 Jan., 1916).

air-car, see quotation from *W. Daily Mail*, 10 Sept., 1921:

AIRWOMEN.

By HARRY HARPER.

It is quite clear already that women do not intend to be content for one moment to remain on the earth during the dawn of the great new era of the air.

More and more women passengers are being booked by the Continental "airways". Quite often they outnumber the men. Nor are they going to be content to play a merely passive part and simply sit in a machine that someone else is piloting. They are going to handle for themselves some of the neat, swift "air-cars" that are now forthcoming.

air Chief-Marshall, title of a general in the Royal Air Force.

air circus, explained under *circus*; cf. quotation:

The same sort of thing is observable even in the air service. The Richthofen air circus fell to pieces immediately its leader was killed, like a company that loses its star actor. (*Daily Mail*, 15 July, 1918).

air-commodore, a commodore in the Royal air Force, ranking next to an air-Vice-Marshal.

air-communication, communication between two countries, towns, etc. by air-service:

The development of air-communication in the Italian colonies is also receiving attention (Hazell's *Annual*, 1920, p. 721).

Air Congress, self-explanatory:

The Air Ministry arranged an Air Congress, held at the Guildhall, London, on Oct. 12—14. (Hazell's *Annual*, 1920, p. 720).

Air Council, see quotation from Hazell's *Annual*, 1920, p. 719:

In October the constitution of the Air council was changed, and it now consists of the following: "One of his Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State (who shall be President of the Air Council) the parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Air, the Chief of the Air Staff, the Controller-General of Civil Aviation, the Director-General of Supply and Research, and the Secretary of the Air Ministry. Of the members of the Air Council (other than the President) the Chief of the Air Staff shall be appointed by his Majesty and the other members shall be appointed by the Secretary of State. There may be included in the Air Council such additional members (if any), not exceeding two, as may be appointed by the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State is to be responsible to his Majesty and Parliament for all the business of the Air Council".

air craft, 1 aeroplane(s), or balloon(s); 2 airmanship (*Concise Oxf. Dict.*). With *aircraft* we have the following compounds: *aircraft arrow*, a winged dart dropped from aircraft (Cassell's *Engl. Dict.*); *aircraft carrier*, a specially built vessel with a very extensive upper deck for flying-machines to go up from and land upon; *aircraft factory*, a factory where aeroplanes are made.

air crash, same as *crash* q. v.

airdrome, same as aerodrome (Webster, *Dict.*).

air-eddy, an eddy in the air-currents of the atmosphere (Cassell's *Engl. Dict.*).

air-express, an express flying-machine on the service of an air-line.

air-fleet, 1 a group or assemblage of aircraft; 2 esp. a large group of military aircraft under a single command; 3 also, the collective military aircraft of a nation (Webster, *Dict.*).

Air Force, the Royal Air Force of England.

FUTURE OF THE AIR FORCE.

The Prime Minister, when asked in Parliament whether it was intended to abolish the Air Ministry and the Air Force as a separate service, replied: "No such decision has been taken by the Government". (*W. Daily Mail*, 19 Nov. 1921).

air hole, a local region in the atmosphere having a downward movement of the air and offering less than normal support for the aerofoils of a flying machine (Webster, *Dict.*).

air-lane, a path through the air made easy for aerial navigation by steady winds (Webster, *Dict.*).

air-line, no longer exclusively a straight line through the air, a bee-line (see the dictionary), but also the regular service of a number of flying-machines flying between certain places:

The volume of traffic by the air-lines from London to the Continent is steadily increasing, although mail matter is not yet very great. (*Hazell's Annual*, 1920, p. 720).

air-liner, a flying-machine put on the service of an air-line.

Air Lord, jocularly formed, as a companion to *Sea Lord*.

air machine, a machine for going up in the air.

air mail, or aerial mail, the mail carried through the air by flying-machine:

By connecting up the ordinary mail services the air mails save twenty-four hours in the delivery of correspondence to Switzerland, Italy, Spain, Portugal (via Paris), and Germany, Austria, Hungary, Sweden, Denmark, etc. (via Brussels). *Hazell's Annual*, 1920, p. 720.)

Compounds as, e.g., *airmail letter* and *airmail service* are quite common already.

airman, 1. aviator in general; 2. a man belonging to the Royal Air Force, especially a pilot:

There are no longer either "ratings" or "men" in flying; the official decree has gone forth that henceforward these old R.N.A.S. and R.F.C. terms are to be substituted by the word "airmen."

It follows, therefore, that to speak of those commissioned officers who do actually fly machines and airships as airmen is now incorrect. Officially they are pilots or observers, as the case may be. (*Daily Mail*, 24 Aug. 1918).

Air Marshal, title of a Lieutenant General in the Royal Air Force.

air mechanic, a mechanic employed on the repair of aircraft (Cassell's *Engl. Dict.*); 2 also a grade in the Royal Air Force (*Pocket Oxf. Dict.*).

air merchant, slang term for balloon officer, flying man:

In a little estaminet some way from the front several officers had finished dinner and were dawdling over their liqueurs. The conversation had turned upon what it felt like to go over the top.

Smithson had been holding forth, and he turned chaffingly to Clarke, a balloon officer invited in to make up a four, and remarked, "Anyhow, you air merchants escape *that*!"

"Do we?" answered the balloon officer, removing his pipe. "I'll just tell you what it feels like for us to make a forced parachute descent." (*Daily Mail*, 1 July, 1918).

Air Ministry, a ministry consisting of the Secretary of State for Air, an Air Secretary and Private Secretary, an Assistant Private Secretary.

air navigation, another word for aerial navigation.

Air Officer, an officer in the Royal Air Force.

air pilot, a person directing the course of an airship, aeroplane, etc.:

FIRST WOMAN AIR PILOT.

The first Englishwoman pilot to land an aeroplane at Croydon Aerodrome is the Hon. Mrs. Poppy Wyndham (daughter of Lord Inchcape), a well-known film actress, who flew over to Croydon from Stag-lane, Cricklewood. She had as passenger Captain Horne, her instructor. He never controlled the machine during the flight, and expressed absolute confidence in the ability of the pilot. (*W. Daily Mail*, 15 Oct., 1921.)

air padre, a chaplain in the Royal Air Force.

air plane, soldier's word for aeroplane.

air-pocket, abrupt local alteration in atmospheric conditions, causing an aeroplane to drop suddenly as a ball into the billiard pocket (*Concise Oxf. Dict.*)

air port, a place provided with mooring posts, hangars etc., from which airships start and where they can land after their flight:

The air-terminus for London has been changed from Hendon to Croydon, but Cricklewood is also an air-port with its Customs office (*Hazell's Annual*, 1920, p. 720).

air-post, conveyance of mail-matter by means of flying-machines:

The granting of the subsidy is conditional on the maintenance of air-communication and of an air-post (*Hazell's Annual*, 1920, p. 721).

Both words seem to be mechanical translations of the German *Luftpost* and *Luftverbindung*.

air-power, aeroplanes, balloons, etc. as means of defence:

THE USES OF AIR-POWER.

Almost every day seems to develop new and unexpected capacities in the usefulness of aeroplanes (*Daily Mail*, 1915)

air-raid, an attack on a town, camp, factory, and by aircraft throwing bombs, hence *air-raider*, one taking part in an air-raid and *air-raid shock*:

IN COMMEMORATION OF ARMISTICE DAY.

Punch has already pleaded for the little children who have suffered from air-raid shock and are being cared for at St. Nicholas' Home, Chailey, and he takes no shame to plead again. (*Punch*, 11 Dec, 1918, p. 388)

air regulations, regulations anent aerial navigation:

Germany possesses a Ministry of Air land Transport. The Department for Air supervises general questions concerning air regulations, aerodromes, aerial photography, the distribution of material, the classification and testing of types, inventions, meteorology and intelligence, wireless telegraphy, and the control of aerial organisations. (*Hazell's Annual*, 1920, p. 721).

air-route, route followed by flying-machines:

The Cairo-Cape air-route was declared open on Dec. 26, 1919 (*Hazell's Annual* 1920, p. 718).

air-scout, an airman employed as a scout (*Cassell's Engl. Dict.*).

air-screw, propeller of an aeroplane.

air-service, the regular plying of flying-machines carrying passengers, goods, mail-matter between certain places:

The air-service between London and Paris has become almost a common-place of modern life (*The Graphic*, 21 Febr., 1920).

air speed, see quotation from the Sketch :

An aeroplane is designed to travel at a certain maximum speed in still air, according to the power of its engine and the set of its planes. This maximum is known as the "air speed."

air-squadron, an aeroplane squadron, a squadron of fighting 'planes.

air-staff, a staff of the Royal Air Force.

air-station, a place where airships are stationed :

SEAPLANE FISH HUNT.

The seaplane provided by the air station at Felixstowe for experiments in viewing shoals of herrings from the air has made its first flight, with a scientist from the Lowestoft marine biological laboratory on board (*W. Daily Mail*, 21 Oct., 1921)

air-terminus, terminal station for flying machines, see *air-post*.

air-torpedo, see *aerial torpedo*.

air-tractor, an aeroplane with any number of main planes, having its propeller in front (also called *tractor machine*).

air-traffic, traffic of flying-machines.

air transport company, a company carrying on transport of passengers and goods by means of flying-machines:

Each pilot is obliged to hold a pilot's certificate issued by the State Air Department and, except in the case of flights carried out by air transport companies a permit issued by the police authorities for each flight (*Hazell's Annual*, 1920, p. 721)

airway, another word for air-route, see quotation under *air-car*.

Air-Vice-Marshal, title of a Major-General in the Royal Air Force, cp. *Air-Chief-Marshal*, *Air-Vice-Marshal*, and *Air-Commodore*. In *Hazell's Annual* 1920, however, the gradation list is as follows: *Air-Marshal*, *Air-Vice Marshal*, *Air-Commodore*.

air-work, the manœuvring of aeroplanes :

Keeping very high, the German aeroplanes came over General Favart's army. Manœuvring superbly, they extended in open order in one long line, long enough to take the whole front of the French advance. It was a masterly piece of air-work, beautiful in its perfect precision (*Sketch*, 1915, p. 124)

air-woman, a female aviator, see quotation under *air-car*.

airy, the air-fleet in contradistinction to the Navy, but the word has not caught on :

Nobody pointed out to him that our Navy was even more powerful now than when war was declared; that our huge new Army was still intact, whilst the Expeditionary Force was up to, if not beyond, its original strength; that our Airy—one can't keep on saying "Flying Department" until the end of time—did precisely as it chose; that the German commerce was stopped; that German food-supplies had been cut off; that the German Navy was utterly useless; that the flower of the German Army had perished; that the German Airy was the laughing-stock of the world. (*Sketch*, Febr., 1915.)

airplane, a vulgar corruption of *aeroplane*.

Albatros(s), type of heavy German warplane with an enormous tail plane and a rather small vertical fin and wings that can be staggered as desired.

Aldis, part of a machine-gun :

I now got a good opportunity, as he was coming towards me nose on and slightly underneath, and had apparently not seen me. I dropped my nose, got him in my Aldis, and pressed both triggers. As soon as I fired, up came his nose at me, and I heard *clack-clack-clack-clack* as his bullets passed close to me and through my wings (*Daily Mail*, 13 July, 1918).

All clear, the bugle call announcing that the danger from air-raiding flying-machines was over:

I do not know how many bugle calls are familiar to the Army of to-day. A rough calculation tells me there must be at least 50—and that is quite enough for any recruit to remember.

Going straight from London to a south of England camp the difference strikes one forcibly. Except for the "All Clear" on raid nights and the Sunday route marches of the Boy Scouts, London has never known the beauty of the bugle.

Alleman(d), Allemande, German :

You must not share or even sympathise with the contempt of one incorrigible in my platoon who, as soon as the rapid fire ceased, was heard to call over the parapet in that peculiarly raucous and penetrating voice of his, "Put another shilling in the meter, Allemand!" (*Punch*, 9 July, 1915).

It is a pity we mayn't shoot now... Sure, the Allemans is always potterin' about here. (G. V. Williams, *With our Army in Flanders*, p. 201).

"Next time," said he, "we shall go a lot farther, next time farther again. We keep plugging at it. The Allemande can't scrap like our chaps" (*Weekly Disp.* 5 Dec. 1915).

Are you ready for a sortie among the Alleymans, Bill? Those that are in favour, hold up their hands. (*Canada in Khaki*, II, p. 58b.)

All-Frightfullest, a nickname for the Kaiser :

Indeed, I suppose we have most of us dreamed it for ourselves more than once during the War, as an alternative to exploding Essen with a secret ray, or capturing the All-Frightfullest, or any other of the flattering tales that sleep can whisper to the pillowed patriot. (*Punch*, Dec., 1917).

All-Highest, the~, the German Emperor, also called the Lord High Hun and, after his ignominious flight, the *All Lowest* :

The Emperor's passion for display, for self-advertisement, is well known. We are told that even during war time the letters of the All-Highest must never be folded, and that the articles snipped out of newspapers must be "pasted on stiff sheets of gilded and ornamented paper, and placed in a portfolio decked with the Imperial Arms." (*Daily Tel.*, 3 Sept., 1915)

As most of the world knows, Wilhelm II. styles himself *Der Allerhöchste*—The All-Highest. Each time he returns to his capital the fact is announced in the following outrageous and ungrammatical formula:—"His Majesty are returned to Berlin. All-Highest the Same Ones (*Allerhöchstdieselben*) rejoice themselves in possession of a blooming health," etc. (*Daily Mail*, 27 July, 1918).

allotmentitis, the craze for allotment-gardens during the great war :

The "father of the House of Lords," the Earl of Ducie, who enters his ninetieth year to-morrow, takes a great interest in "allotmentitis"—the patriotic excitement of the hour. (*Sunday Pictorial*, 24 June, 1917).

Ally Sloper's Cavalry, military slang for the Army Service Corps :

BRAVO, ARMY SERVICE CORPS!

Those who used to laugh at the Army Service Corps as the Army "Safety" Corps have long since found out their mistake. Yesterday I met a corporal who was in what the "Tommies" call "Ally Sloper's Cavalry." He had been wounded three times and had been awarded the D.C.M. and the Russian Order of St George. (*Daily Mirror*, 23 Sept. 1916)

all-round traverse, a machine-gun mounted on a swivel so that it can be turned in any direction (Cassell's *N.E.D.* 1919, *Supplement*)

Amex = American Expeditionary Force.

ammo, the gunner's abbreviation of *Ammunition* :

A train-load of ammunition [a gunner calls it "ammo"] has first to be divided into dumps for 13-pounder, 18-pounder, or 4.5 howitzer, and these are subdivided into dumps for high-explosive, shrapnel, lachrymatory, smoke, or gas shells of their respective sizes. Thus, an urgent order for shells arrives, sometimes in the dead of night, and it is instantly supplied without confusion. (*Daily Mail*, 24 Sept., 1918)

amphibian, a kind of flying-machine, see quotation:

The Air Ministry competitions included a division for "amphibians", or machines with a boat or floats provided also with a wheeled landing-device that can be drawn up out of the way in flight and for descents on water or let down for alighting on land. (Hazell's *Annual*, 1921, p. 719b.)

Andrew Miller, a nickname for the British Navy:

The nautical nickname for the British navy is "Andrew Miller," and occasionally "Merry Andrew," and British sailors still describe themselves occasionally by the word "matlo." This word, however, is falling into disuse and is only recognized by the older men. It is really a corruption of the French "matelot," and dates from the Crimean War, when English and French sailors worked together. (*Manchester Guardian*, 8 June 1916.)

angary, the confiscation or destruction by a belligerent of neutral property, esp. shipping, subject to claim for compensation.

angel's whisper, *the ~*, the bugle call for defaulters. The translation of it runs: "Be a defaulter as long as you like — as long as you answer your name".

anti = anti-conscriptionist:

At the time of writing (as for many days previously) our twenty-two supermen are trying to make up their minds. The delay has been caused, it is alleged, by the efforts of the "Antis" to persuade Mr. Asquith that his Snark was a Boojum. "Let us have delay," the "Antis" cry: "let us give the slackers another chance. To save our faces do not let us confess that the voluntary system has failed." (*W. D.*, 2 Jan., 1916)

(To be continued.)

F. P. H. PRICK VAN WELY.

Contributions to English Syntax.

XII.

The Nominative with Infinitive and Participle.

When we have a noun with an infinitive, as in *I persuaded him to go out*, we may speak of an accusative with infinitive, but it is only an apparent accusative with infinitive when we compare such a sentence as *I wanted John to go out*¹⁾. It would be inconvenient, however, to distinguish an apparent from a real accusative with infinitive, because it would sometimes be doubtful which of the two was presented in a given case. Even verbs that regularly have an apparent accusative with infinitive may occasionally be construed with a genuine one: see *Handbook* § 490.

It is well-known that many verbs that can take an accusative with infinitive can also be construed with a nominative and infinitive: *He was persuaded to go out*, where *he* may be looked upon as a real subject, but also *Records of proceedings were ordered to be kept*, where *records* is, of course, not the subject of *were ordered*, but of *were ordered to be kept*, so that we have a genuine nominative with infinitive here. It is worth noting, however, that the nominative with infinitive does not occur with verbs that have a genuine accusative with infinitive only. I am referring to the verbs of wishing (not those of will i.e. of causing): *to wish*, *to want*, *to like*, *to prefer*, *to hate*. I purposely leave out *to desire* and *to mean*, for these if construed with an accusative with infinitive belong to the verbs of causing.

¹⁾ It is significant that there is not a single O.E. or M.E. example of an accusative with infinitive after verbs of wishing in Jacob Zeitlin's dissertation on the subject.

The question is naturally asked how it is that the nominative with infinitive is not used with verbs of wishing. The answer cannot be that the nominative with infinitive in English is only an apparent one, for the genuine construction has been shown to occur. But it seems to follow from the facts mentioned that the genuine nominative with infinitive is only used in the case of verbs that can take an apparent (i.e. analysable) accusative with infinitive. The construction, therefore, is one step behind the development of the corresponding active construction.

It is natural to consider, in this connection, the similar constructions with the present participle. Such a sentence as *I saw him looking at a dead flower* may be turned into the passive: *He was seen looking at a dead flower* (*Handbook*, 695). But it is clear that the nominative with present participle occurs only in the case of verbs that have an apparent accusative with participle, i.e. in cases when the accusative can be analysed as an object. At any rate I have not observed the construction with *to have*, *set*, *like*, *want*, etc. (*Handbook*, 694). As far as I know, therefore, the nominative with participle is one step behind the corresponding infinitive-construction: the genuine nominative never occurs at all.

A third construction that might be examined is what has been called the *accusative with gerund*, whether plain gerund (*Excuse me getting up*) or prepositional gerund (*Excuse me from getting up*)¹. It is evident that a passive construction is possible here, so that an apparent nominative with gerund is certainly quite common. But I hardly think the genuine construction is found in English, although a construction like: *The Bill was prevented from becoming law by the factious opposition of irresponsible men*, might be passed as correct English. If this should be true, we could conclude that the nominative with gerund is as far advanced as the nominative with infinitive.

E. KRUISINGA.

Lewis Theobald.

Lewis Theobald: His Contribution to English Scholarship with some Unpublished Letters by RICHARD FOSTER JONES, PH. D. New York, Columbia University Press, 1919. \$ 2.00.

This book, a volume of the Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, is the latest tribute²) to the work of the Porson of Shakespearean criticism, as Theobald was afterwards called, when his reputation as a scholar had recovered from the virulent and slanderous attacks of the "little crooked thing", Alexander Pope. It also sets up the thesis that the basic principles of critical editing in English were derived directly from the method employed by Bentley in the classics.

I could a tale unfold, an enormous, labyrinthine, extensive one, like the tail of a long lost saurian of palaeontologic fame, if I attempted to follow the subject of Dr. Foster Jones's study throughout all the vicissitudes and adventures of his busy life as they are depicted in the more than two hundred and fifty pages,

¹) *Lessons in English Grammar* by E. Kruisinga and J. H. Schutt, p. 71.

²) For earlier works recognizing the merits of Theobald as a textual critic the reader is referred to Karl Elze, *Grundriss der englischen Philologie* (2e aufl. 1889); Bülbring, *Wege und Ziele der englischen Philologie* (1893); Lounsbury, *First Editors of Shakespeare* (1906); Dennis, *Age of Pope* (1909), etc.

minus the four appendices which give a sum total of 355 pages, of the volume before us. Avoiding all irrelevant details I hope to give the main features of Theobald's labours and experiences.

To begin *ab ovo*, Lewis Theobald was born in the early part of 1688 in Sittingbourne, Kent, where according to a contemporary biography his father was an eminent attorney. He was named after a friend of the family, Lewis Watson, Earl of Rockingham, who made his namesake companion to his son, Viscount Sondres, at a school conducted by the Rev. Mr. Ellis at Isleworth in Middlesex. The apparently thorough instruction received here was improved by a sojourn passed under the roof of his kinsman, John Glanville of Broadhurst, Wiltshire, and in appreciation of this kindness Theobald dedicated to him his first attempt at poetry, a Cowleyan Pindaric in praise of the union of Scotland and England, as well as his translation of Aristophanes' *Clouds*.

At some date not later than 1708 Theobald removed to London, where he followed his father's profession. His practice, however, which was more profitable in the latter part of his life, was neither so interesting nor extensive as to prevent his engaging in various literary activities, the most noteworthy of which were translations. In 1713 Bernard Lintot paid him five guineas for a translation of Plato's *Phaedo*, and in the same year he entered into a contract with Lintot to translate all the tragedies of Aeschylus for the modest sum of ten guineas. Though none of the plays was published, evidence seems to show that the work was completed a year or two after the contract was made, the only results however of this enterprise that are left us are a few selections in *The Censor* and *The Grove*, contemporary periodicals, some emendations contributed to a magazine of the day, and those of his notes written in his edition of the dramatist by Stanley, which Bloomfield¹⁾ inserted in his edition of Aeschylus. In the spring of 1714 he entered into another contract with Lintot to translate the whole of the *Odyssey*, and the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, *Oedipus Coloneus*, *Trachiniae*, and *Philoctetes* of Sophocles, together with explanatory notes, into English blank verse. He also contracted to translate the satires and epistles of Horace into English rhyme. For the translations of Homer and Sophocles he was to receive fifty shillings for every 450 lines, while for Horace the price was one guinea for every 120 lines. While Theobald may have translated the four tragedies mentioned above, only one, the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, was published, (1715). The next year, however, Lintot published a translation by Theobald of Sophocles' *Electra*, a play not mentioned in the contract. This was dedicated to Addison, whose friendship the translator enjoyed. Then Theobald turned from tragedy to comedy, and in 1715 appeared his English versions of Aristophanes' *Clouds* and *Plutus*. Of the satires and epistles of Horace no translation appeared, and Theobald's only work in the Latin poets was a version of the first book of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, a poet who was almost as popular as Horace. His next work in the classics is an historical romance garnered from Galen, Appian, Lucian, Julian, and Valerius Maximus, entitled *The History of the Loves of Antiochus and Stratonice*, London, 1719, the last translation of Theobald, the *Hero and Leander* of the mythical Musaeus, appearing in *The Grove*, 1721.

A modern critic, John Churton Collins, calls Theobald's translations meritorious, and speaks of the "free and spirited blank verse" of the version of Sophocles and the "vigorous and racy colloquial prose" of the rendering of the two plays of Aristophanes. But not long after his death there was an

¹⁾ I believe this should be Blomfield.

attempt to depreciate the worth of his work. The effect of *The Dunciad* grew with the years, and Pope's slanders were perpetuated by Warburton and Johnson. In 1753 Professor Thomas Franklin issued a long poem called *Translation*, in which amongst other things the following occurs:

The great translator bids each dunce translate,
And ranks us all with Tibbald and with Tate.

The Genius of Greece is invoked against the ravages and misdeeds of "Tibbald", as Theobald was called by his persecutors:

Genius of Greece, do thou my breast inspire
With some warm portion of the poet's fire,
From hands profane defend his much-lov'd name,
From Cruel Tibbald wrest his mangled frame.

In 1707 Theobald's first attempt at poetry appeared, a Pindaric ode on the union of Scotland and England. Six years later he published *The Mausoleum*, a poem written in heroic couplets and dedicated to Charles, Earl of Orrery. According to Dr. Jones this is a lugubrious effort, stilted and affected, and full of praise for Pope and Addison. In 1715 Theobald translated Le Clerc's observations on Addison's travels, prompted by his admiration for the subject of the treatise. In the same year he wrote a poem on the recovery of the Duke of Ormonde from a dangerous illness, and in this year likewise his most ambitious attempt in verse was published, *The Cave of Poverty*, in imitation of Shakespeare. Professor Lounsbury in his *Text of Shakespeare*, p. 184, comments as follows upon this poem: "The truth is that the production throughout adopts and reflects Shakespeare's phraseology. There is frequently in it a faint echo of his style, and of the peculiar melody of his versification. Such characteristics could have been manifested only by one who had become thoroughly steeped in his diction, and especially in that of his two principal poems. These were so far from being well known at that time that they were hardly known at all". More influences are apparent in the poem: Ovid and Spenser.

Early in 1715 Theobald began the publication of a triweekly periodical, *The Censor*, fashioned after the *Spectator*. This ran for thirty numbers, from April 11 to June 17. It then suspended publication until January 1, 1717, when it again appeared and continued to June 1, ending with the ninety-sixth number. Theobald attributed the failure of the undertaking to its following "too close upon the Heels of the inimitable *Spectator*". Although Theobald has fared badly enough at the hands of Pope and succeeding generations, yet another attempt has been made to find an attack on him in Parnell's *Life and Remarks of Zoilus* appended to a translation of the *Batrachomyomachia*, 1717. Goldsmith appears to be the original authority for the idea that the satire was written at the request of Parnell's friends to whom Pope belonged, and directed against Theobald and Dennis. But probably Zoilus stands for Bentley, as this nickname was most frequently applied to the great critic. There is nothing in the production satirically appropriate to Theobald at that time, and probably Pope had never heard of him. In 1719 Theobald wrote a life of Sir Walter Raleigh, which seems a rather bald production, and two years later he collected and published a volume of miscellanies, *The Grove; or a Collection of Original Poems, Translations, etc.*, containing his translations from Sophocles, Aeschylus, and Musaeus, and a few of his poems; two prologues, one spoken by Mr. Keene, the other occasioned by his death; and a poem, *To Cloe, upon her Retreat at Fulham*. The collection is remarkable in that it contains Dr. Bentley's only attempt at verse, a poem entitled *A Reply* and dealing with the hardships incurred by scholars.

From the very beginning of his career the future editor of Shakespeare was interested in the drama. As early as 1708 his *Persian Princess* was acted at Drury Lane, when he was only twenty years of age. In 1715 he published a tragedy, *The Perfidious Brother*, which does its author even less credit than his previous play. On December 10, 1719, Theobald's adaptation of Shakespeare's *Richard II* was performed at Lincoln's Inn Fields, and met with some success, being acted seven times. In his alterations he omitted Acts I and II, with the exception of some speeches which he transposed, and introduced a love story. Genest points out in his *History of the English Stage* one absurdity into which Theobald fell, and thinks his additions are flat and his alteration on the whole is a very bad one; but considerably more than half the play is Shakespeare's. Some of Theobald's lines seem to be very good; in fact, they form the best poetry he wrote, and show clearly how closely he had studied Shakespeare.

During Theobald's lifetime there arose a new species of entertainment known as the pantomime. The first to claim credit for introducing these performances into England was John Weaver, a dancing master, and in 1716 John Rich followed in his footsteps. In the constructing of these pantomimes Theobald was very closely associated with his friend, John Rich. Previously he had composed several trivial pieces, all presented at Lincoln's Inn Fields. One was a one-act opera, *Pan and Syrinx*, produced in 1717, but he began his pantomimes in 1725 with *Harlequin Sorcerer, with the Loves of Pluto and Proserpine*, which drew crowded houses even after its revival at Covent Garden in 1753. After the production of other works of this nature, amongst which *The Rape of Proserpine* which was extremely popular, Theobald's last pantomime *Orpheus and Eurydice, an Opera*, was produced at Covent Garden in 1740, but had been published the preceding year. It appears to have been very successful. On the whole it is in his translations that the Theobald of this first literary period is seen at his best. Most of his dramatic ventures were adaptations or reworkings. His best poem is an avowed imitation. His interest in the Greek drama was genuine and intelligent.

Theobald marks the beginning of a new era in Shakespearean textual criticism. Adequate recognition of his work on Shakespeare has been slow in coming, but now his reputation is fairly well established. In his method he plainly follows Richard Bentley, the greatest classical scholar of his age, famous for his amazingly clever and thorough *Dissertation on the Epistles of Phalaris*, the *Epistle to Mill*, his edition of Horace etc. The pages of his *Epistle* and *Dissertation* are strewn with emendations, and he is *facile princeps* amongst his contemporaries in textual criticism. Bentley may well be considered the first modern scholar, for the elements underlying his scholarship are still operative. The spirit of modern scholarship is the desire to gain with minute accuracy all the information and evidence on the subject of the investigation, arranged and ordered in its proper relations. Imbued with this spirit Bentley, instead of losing himself in a maze of unorganized knowledge, learned to systematize his material in such a way that he could focus upon a point, however minute, almost all that could throw any light upon it. He had perfect command over the materials of his learning, and built up his proofs with all the sureness and accuracy of a master builder. There had been scholars of as great if not greater erudition, but none whose reasoning was so close and clear. Whether he is eradicating a textual error, controverting atheists, or establishing the spuriousness of the Phalaris letters, the same powerful analytical spirit is active. Moreover he insists on minute accuracy, and this insistence upon "trifles" was the ground of the

bitterest attacks on him as a pedant. His enemies believed that only the large things, such as sentiment and philosophy, were of importance. Another feature of this minute study that attracted the scorn of the wits was the establishment of chronology to which Bentley had paid considerable attention in his dissertation. Bentley used his extensive learning, not to express a general view of antiquity, but to establish some particular point. He was master of his knowledge, and wielded it with ruthless logic toward the correction of error and the establishment of truth. In comparing Bentley with Scaliger Jebb says: "While Scaliger had constantly before him the conception of antiquity as a whole to be mentally grasped, Bentley's criticism rested on a knowledge more complete in detail; it was also conducted with a closer and more powerful logic." Bentley began an epoch; he established a new school of criticism, to which the greatest scholars of later times have belonged. But like most men who have something to say, Bentley has *les défauts de ses qualités*. While his *Horace* shows his critical method on a large scale and in a most striking form, it illustrates his defects as conspicuously as his strength. The defect was a readiness, doubtless engendered by previous success in corrupt Greek texts, to correct, by strict logic and the normal usage of words, passages which made very good meaning as they stood — a readiness that proved disastrous to Bentley because he possessed a *iudicium logicum* rather than *iudicium poeticum*. I remember my former master of Greek, who was indeed a master of Greek, Professor Cobet, speaking of Bentley in the highest terms of praise and admiration, and holding up to us for emulation the three great R's of English classical scholarship, Richard Bentley, Richard Dawes, and Richard Porson. I also remember how he used to scoff at the exaggerated authority certain scholars would profess for the ancient manuscripts, fearing to alter anything *adversus fidem veterum membranarum*. But he also had his limitations. He had a supreme contempt for the comparative study of languages, which he nicknamed „taalvergelijkerij," and once I heard him say to a student: "If you don't know *that*, you had better go and study English." And to write this in a periodical called *English Studies*!

We should not profess a too great reverence for ancient texts and manuscripts, but approach them with some suspicion; on the other hand the distrust of accepted readings may become a sort of psychological prepossession. Men sought for faults, and because they read texts with this idea in mind, discovered many absurdities that were merely their own hallucinations. They were obsessed with an idea of faulty texts. It became a kind of mania.

There were several factors at work fostering this rage for emending. The success and convincing nature of Bentley's method inspired scholars with a sincere faith in the efficacy of conjectural criticism. Thirlby says in the dedication to his Justin Martyr that he would not place criticism lower than any art either in dignity of matter or utility of gift, and writing in *The Censor*, April 20, 1715, Theobald expresses his regard for antiquity and criticism. He is describing the volumes on the shelves of his study and *inter alia* he says: "In opposite Columns to these stand the Restorers of ancient Learning who are continually snatching delicious Morsels from the Mouth of Time, and forcing that general Robber to a Restitution of his ill-gotten Goods.... When upon stumbling over the first Shelves I have discovered an uncommon Beauty and Strength of Wit in an imperfect Paragraph, I grieve as much that I cannot cover the Whole, as a brave man would for the Amputation of a Limb, from a strong and vigorous Body that had done his country great Services, and seemed to promise it

yet greater. If upon these Occasions any of the learned happen to have supplied that Defect, by restoring a maimed Sentence to its original Life and Spirit, I pay him the same Regard as the ancient Romans did to one who has preserved the life of a fellow-citizen." Emending had also a great fascination, and presented all the attractions of a puzzle in seeing what can be substituted and still satisfy the requirements of the passage. Men engaged in it as a *tour de force*. This fascination grew so strong as to be almost irresistible, as is well testified to by Bentley's *Milton*, which proved as great a failure as his *Horace* had been a success.

Immediately after the publication of Bentley's *Horace* a small host of pamphlets was issued, directed against Bentley in particular and emendatory criticism in general. As long as Bentley had confined his labours to such writers as Malalos, Phalaris, Menander, and Philemon, he was beyond the ken of many of the wits, but when he laid hands upon Horace, he was desecrating the popular idol. Horace was immensely popular in that time, people quoted him freely, travelled with their Horace in their pocket or portmanteau, and one Dr. Douglas is described as regularly Horace-mad. Satires on Bentley's edition were forthcoming, one of them in poetic form containing the lines :

Bentley immortal honour gets,
By changing Que's to nobler Et's :
From Cam to Isis see him roam,
To fetch stray'd Interjections home :
While the glad shores with joy rebound
For Periods and lost Commas found :
Poor Adverbs, that had long deplor'd
Their injur'd rights, by him restor'd
Smil'd to survey a rival's doom,
While they possessed the envied room

Le Clerc, at this time Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Amsterdam, who had reasons for disliking Bentley, issued a restrained pamphlet against him, which was straightway translated into English and published in London. Bentley's *Horace* awakened the slumbering resentment against conjectural criticism ; while attacks at first were generally levelled against him for his boldness, this feeling gradually extended against all performers in the field. And for successive years "the noise of battle roll'd" between the wits and the "pedants", both of them obstinately clinging to their own views, and often heaping personalities and abuse upon one another. But although the opposition to this peculiar study was energetic enough and indulged in by the foremost wits of the time, ultimately their attacks failed, Bentley's labours reaching their flower in Porson, and Theobald's in the later capable critics of Shakespeare.

In an age so obsessed with the idea of correcting and so prodigal of praise, as well as blame, for the corrector, it was only natural that sooner or later the critical spirit should break through classical bounds and seek unconquered worlds beyond. Shakespeare was the first to attract attention. Here was a rich field for the textual critic and the reward promised to be proportioned to the popularity of the poet, the progress of the originally poor text through four folios having left the plays in a worse condition than many manuscripts of the classics. Here then was an opportunity of reaping fame and distinction, and it was as if the spirit of the time urged the learned scholars to devote their energies to him who was for all time. Dr. George Sewell remarks after mentioning the critical care expended upon classical authors: "What then has been done by the really Learned

to the dead languages, by treading backward into the Paths of Antiquity and reviving and correcting good old Authors, we in Justice owe to our great Writers, both in Prose and Poetry. They are in some degree our Classics; on their foundations we must build, as the Formers and refiners of our Language." But if the similarity between the classics and Shakespeare's text was noticed, it was not until two editions had been printed that the classical method was applied. Rowe suggested comparing the text with earlier editions, but seems to have based his chiefly on the fourth folio. While some of his emendations have proved satisfying, and while he rendered real service in giving the lists of *dramatis personae* to the plays lacking them, as well as dividing some of the plays into acts and scenes, his edition was not a critical one. Pope's edition, 1725, represents a more critical treatment of the text. One portion of an editor's duty, the most important, he recognized and clearly stated, that of collating the text with the old copies. But this for the greater part he failed to do although possessing, according to his own word, the means. When it came to the removing of obscurity either by explanation or conjecture, he failed signally. For this task there is needed the most critical spirit and the broadest knowledge of Elizabethan and pre-Elizabethan literature. Pope lacked both. Emendations he did make, but the majority were adopted to reduce Shakespeare's metre to eighteenth-century regularity. He evidently felt nothing of the rugged grandeur of Shakespeare's rhythm. For the rest of his conjectures he was wholly dependent upon his judgment, and anything that did not appeal to his taste ran the risk of being relegated to the bottom of the page. Unwilling as he was to collate carefully, he must have been all the more unwilling to investigate, analyze, and study corrupt passages, or undertake to become familiar with the literature current in Shakespeare's time. Nor does he seem to have made any study of the peculiarities of Shakespeare's grammar or diction. The only supports of his critical method are collation, carelessly followed, metrical skill, and taste. A few of his emendations based upon taste have found their way into most modern editions, as well as a larger number of his metrical emendations; yet these are upheld by no evidence, and draw on no authorities. Elsewhere we find even his judgment unsafe, and we perceive no inclination to scrutinize carefully every doubt and draw out stores of knowledge to remove it. But of course there were found, as always, interested persons and flatterers, belonging to a special literary set or clique, willing to hail Pope's edition as a sort of master-stroke, and William Broome, who was employed by Pope in making extracts from Eustathius for the notes to his translation of the *Iliad*, broke forth into a rapturous, not to say hysterical panegyric,

Shakespere rejoice! his hand thy Page refines,
Now every Scene with native Brightness shines.¹⁾

Pope's edition however brought forth the first truly critical work on Shakespeare. This was Theobald's *Shakespeare Restored: or a Specimen of the Many Errors, as well committed, as Unamended, by Mr. Pope In his*

¹⁾ Pope however was not exceedingly grateful, as will happen in circumstances of this kind. All literatures may afford examples of the same behaviour. In his *Bathos* Pope describes Broome as one of those "parrots who repeat another's words in such a hoarse odd tone as makes them seem their own", and in *The Dunciad* he has the following reference to him "Hibernian politics, O Swift, thy doom
And mine, translating ten whole years with Broome."

Late Edition of this Poet Designed Not only to correct the said Edition, but to restore the True Reading of Shakespeare in all the Editions ever yet publish'd. The book appeared in March 1726, and is a large quarto volume, dedicated to John Rich and containing 194 pages. The first 132 are in large print, and are devoted primarily to *Hamlet*. The rest, under the title of Appendix, is in smaller print, and contains remarks on nearly all the plays. *The Merchant of Venice* and *Troilus and Cressida* lead the list with five remarks each, while *Macbeth* and *Coriolanus* follow next with four each. A number of the plays are commented on only once. The first half of the Appendix is devoted to showing Pope's mistakes under these heads: emendation where there is no need of it; maiming the author by unadvised degradations; bad choice in various readings and degradation of the better word; and mistakes in giving the meaning of words. Besides this the critic shows Pope's mistakes in pointing and "transpositions", and the inaccuracies due to inattention to Shakespeare and history. The rest of the "Appendix" from page 165 to the end, is devoted entirely to emendations. The nature of each remark is designated in the margin, so that the reader may be apprised of the content, by such terms as "false printing", "false pointing", "various reading", "passage omitted", "conjectural emendation", "emendation", and the like. There are nearly a hundred corrections on *Hamlet* and a few over a hundred on the other plays. The only plays not mentioned by Theobald are *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *As You Like it*, and *Twelfth Night*.

Theobald was unusually well equipped for the office of a textual critic on Shakespeare. He was somewhat of a poet, he possessed a tireless industry, he was thoroughly conversant with the stage, he had an intimate knowledge of Shakespeare's thought and diction, and last of all he had a wide knowledge of the classics and the methods of classical scholarship. On one phase of classical scholarship, the most prevalent during this time, Theobald placed great value, viz. textual and verbal criticism, and furthermore he was intimately acquainted with the work of the great textual critic Bentley. He models his edition of Shakespeare upon Bentley's Amsterdam Horace. In upholding the value of literal criticism he appeals to Bentley's success. Having recognized the similarity between the state of the text of Shakespeare and that of the text of Greek and Latin authors, Theobald applied the classical method to it, which had been heralded by Bentley. A comparison of a few of Theobald's notes with some of Bentley's shows conclusively that the former was consciously imitating the method of the latter. In following Bentley's lead and example Theobald himself put up an example to others, and it would appear as if he said to himself:

Grow great by your example and put on
The dauntless spirit of resolution.

The author gives several instances of the close coincidence and conformity of Bentley's and Theobald's remarks. Theobald's notes easily fall into the divisions made for classical textual criticism — the critical doubt, emendation, and conjectural criticism. He scrutinizes the text with critical care, and produces his proofs with learning and logic. There is no jumping at conclusions, neither is there any blind acceptance of unintelligible passages, but in their stead a careful weighing of evidence, a logical handling of facts towards the ascertaining of a corruption, just as Bentley's grammatical criticism contains the very same elements.

Like Bentley Theobald also uses historical criticism a great deal, and by his knowledge of history and mythology he is able to correct several blunders

of Pope's. Both Theobald and Bentley make bold to engage in aesthetic criticism, the most dangerous of the three: *periculosae plenum opus aleae*. Here it would not be rash to grant the Shakespearean critic precedence over the classical scholar. The logical nature of Bentley's mind, which was of so much assistance in establishing fact and restoring meaning to unintelligible passages, was more of a hindrance than a help in judging literature by artistic standards. He could not overcome the tendency to inject logical consistency into a poetical passage. The shining example in this respect is his edition of Milton, where his notes are logical enough, but with a logic that makes poetry prose. Aesthetic criticism requires more than knowledge, more than logic. It requires a certain innate perception, nourished by a close and sympathetic study of the best in literature. An aesthetic critic must be a potential artist. Here Theobald shows his superiority. He was a poet, poor indeed, but with judgment superior to his accomplishments. His criticisms are worth reading when he speaks of a passage as possessing energy or elegance, as being bald and mean, marred by tautology or indifferent English.

In the actual emendation the two critics both show almost uncanny sagacity. Though Bentley evinces in his notes more learning and sheer mental power, Theobald's emendations give just as clear proof that he was possessed of that peculiar indefinable gift necessary to any great corrector. Furthermore Theobald has more respect for manuscript authority than Bentley (the earlier editions of Shakespeare corresponding to the manuscripts of classical authors). However, as regards manuscript assistance, Bentley was far more fortunate than Theobald in his *apparatus criticus*. Many are the manuscripts and editions of Horace that figure in his notes. Theobald on the other hand, had to rely for his remarks on *Hamlet* on the second folio, the 1637 quarto, a 1703 quarto, and Hughes' quarto. For part of his work he had an opportunity of examining the fourth folio. For the rest of the plays he had to content himself with the folios just mentioned, the 1600 quarto of *Much Ado About Nothing*, the 1611 quarto of *Titus Andronicus*, and a 1655 quarto of *Lear*. He also, perhaps, derived some slight help from later alterations of the plays.

Theobald's lack of knowledge of the literature of Shakespeare's age was a serious defect in his method, but it was in overcoming this deficiency that his edition of Shakespeare makes a pronounced advance over his first critical effort.

The work is also unique for its time in that it is permeated by a sincere desire for truth rather than victory, a desire that makes the critic confess and correct a mistake made on an earlier page. There is a ring of sincerity in the statement, "Whenever I am mistaken, it will be a Pleasure to me to be *corrected*, since the Public will at the same Time be undeceived". Though he speaks of the "Applause of the Readers" and implies that he acted on a "View of Reputation", he did not let his desire for glory overcome his love for truth. Yet the very novelty of the undertaking made him regard the outcome with some trepidation. Knowing of the attacks that had been made upon the mighty Bentley and the Royal Society, it is no wonder he felt that he ran a risk. He was somewhat doubtful of the way Pope would receive his book, but was fatuous enough to rely upon the generosity of a man whose regard for Shakespeare and truth was considerable less than his vanity.

From all these statements and observations it may easily be concluded that Theobald's work was of great significance for the study of Shakespeare; he brought to the study of English letters the spirit and the method of

sound scholarship, and he showed by the favour with which his book was received that English writers were worthy of the same study given to the classics. Later we find him turning his attention to Greek and Latin writers, who from days immemorial had been the source and object of investigation. Yet during the first quarter of the eighteenth century the researches of Bentley had been subjected to the bitterest taunts of the wits. If such were the attitude toward Bentley, what would it be toward one who brought Bentley's method to bear on an English poet? Yet Theobald's effort met with wider and more complete favour than Bentley's *Dissertation on Phalaris*. Only the persistent virulence of Pope and the misrepresentation of his later admirers succeeded in belittling the critic's work. At the time, *Shakespeare Restored* met with great success, and this, together with the convincing nature of Theobald's remarks, influenced others to turn their attention to English writers. Theobald came to be known as "the author of *Shakespeare Restored*", and henceforth work on Shakespeare became his chief interest and delight. Among his friends were Matthew Concanen, a lawyer by profession and literary man by choice, Dennis, James Moore-Smythe, and Thomas Cooke, all of them more or less notable men in their time and members of the so-called "Concanen Club." It was at a meeting of this group that Theobald first met William Warburton, Bishop of Gloucester, who like himself was an admirer of Shakespeare, but by far not an equally disinterested one. This friendship with Warburton, although the divine proved to be absolutely faithless, was of considerable assistance to Theobald in rendering him sympathy, encouragement, and inspiration to pull through the dark years following *The Dunciad*. In December 1727 Theobald brought forth a drama purporting to come from the pen of Shakespeare, entitled *Double Falshood; or, The Distrest Lovers*, which was by various authorities attributed to different authors: Shirley, Massinger, Fletcher. Others assigned the play to Theobald, and there was a versified reference to it in *The Grubstreet Journal*, with which Pope may have had some connection. Taken all in all the whole affair is the most faint-hearted undertaking with which Theobald has favoured us, as it appears he himself did not really believe Shakespeare was the author.

The period between *Shakespeare Restored* and the edition of all the plays is marked by a tremendous expansion in Theobald's reading of literature which could assist in correcting or illustrating the text. But things did not continue so very smoothly for Theobald. Pope, feeling very keenly the exposure of the defects of his edition, had been nursing his wrath and preparing his counter stroke in silence. The first blow fell with the publication of the third or so-called "last" volume of Pope and Swift's *Miscellanies*, March, 1728. In his volume, devoted to verse, a prose treatise had been inserted, "Martinus Scriblerus ΠΕΡΙ ΒΑΘΟΥΣ; or of the Art of Sinking in Poetry. Written in the year MDCCXVII." It is generally thought now that the treatise was written with the set purpose of calling forth attacks upon Pope, so that he would seem justified in retaliating with *The Dunciad*; the delay in the publication of the "last" volume of the miscellanies is attributed to the desire to have *The Dunciad* ready for publication. The author has no doubt that such was the purpose of the *Bathos*, but he is inclined to attribute the delay in the publication of the "last" volume to the fact that the treatise itself was not ready. In a letter written to Swift sometime in January, 1728, Pope says that he has entirely methodized the *Bathos* and written all of it. Furthermore, it contains strictures on *Double Falshood* which was not published until 1728. The

Bathos gives selections from several poets in order to show how persons may sink in poetry. Under its various chapters there appear as examples three passages from *Double Falshood*. Chapter 6 treats "Of the several kinds of Genius's in the profound, and the marks and characters of each." Here Pope lists the different kinds of writers under various animals, adding the initials of living authors. Theobald appears under the eels and swallows. This example of literary mud-slinging, likewise well-known in our dearly beloved Dutch literature or what must pass as such, could have had but one purpose — to provoke the infuriated victims to retaliation.

But this was not the only attack on Theobald made in the volume. There appeared in the verse a poem entitled "A Fragment of a Satire." After thrusts at Gildon and Dennis, Pope turns to Theobald:

Should some more sober critics come abroad,
If wrong I smile; if right, I kiss the rod.
Pains, Reading, Study, are their just pretence
And all they want is Spirit, Taste, and Sense.
Commas and Points they set exactly right;
And 't were a sin to rob them of their Mite.
In future Ages how their Fame will spread,
For routing Triplets and restoring *ed*.
Yet ne'er one Sprig of Laurel graced these Ribbalds,
From sanguine Sew—¹⁾ down to piddling T—s.
Who thinks he reads but only scans and spells,
A Word-catcher that lives on syllables.
Yet even this Creature may some Notice claim,
Wrapt round and sanctified with Shakespeare's name;
Pretty in Amber to observe the forms
Of Hairs, or Straws, or Dirt, or Grubs, or Worms;
The Thing, we know, is neither rich nor rare,
But wonder how the Devil it got there.

This "last" volume of miscellanies succeeded in drawing forth some attacks contained in verses, letters, and the like in the current newspapers, and Pope was evidently satisfied with the rather poor results of the provocative treatise on the *Bathos*, for on May 18, 1728, appeared *The Dunciad*. In 1729 a second and last edition appeared, containing about one hundred lines more, and several appendages.

From the various replies called forth by the poem two deductions are obvious: first, that Theobald was made the hero of the satire because of his work on Shakespeare; and second, that his was the clearest case against Pope in that his criticisms were universally recognized as far superior to his adversary's edition. Dennis came to the aid of Theobald and blamed Pope for abusing "several ingenuous men" in *The Dunciad*, "among whom I am obliged, in Justice, to name Mr. Theobald who by delivering Shakespeare from the Injuries of Time, and of lazy, or ignorant and stupid Editors, has obliged all who are concern'd for the Reputation of so great a Genius, or for the Honour of Great Britain." He claims that Pope libelled Theobald for no other reason than that he had been surpassed by him, and denounces the attack on Theobald's poverty and that of others "who have derserv'd a thousand times better both of the country and the Commonwealth of Learning". Concanen also upholds Theobald against Pope,

¹⁾ George Sewell, a friend of Theobald's, who had been dead some two years. He had been associated with Theobald in the preparation of *Shakespeare Restored*. Pope invariably spells Theobald's name Tibbald. Later, when the poem was incorporated in *An Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot* "slashing Bentley" was substituted for "sanguine Sew—" and other changes were made.

and likewise other "dunces" rushed to their king's assistance. Concaen said amongst other things that the only crime Theobald committed was in presuming Pope was not infallible like his namesake of Rome, and could be mistaken, and that Pope would have done well in following the method Theobald had laid down. Two poetic attacks on Pope that appeared the same year as *The Dunciad* were *Sawney, An Heroic Poem. Occasion'd by the Dunciad*, from the pen of James Ralph, and *Durgen or a Plain Satyr upon a Pompous Satyr*, by Edward Ward. Ralph calls *The Dunciad* "an execrable Lampoon". Ward in his preface calls Theobald a man of learning, probity, and distinguishing merits, while in the poem he styles *Shakespeare Restored*, a meritorious work that must meet with the approbation of all good judges. William Duncombe, a person entirely removed from the quarrel, shared the general attitude of the neutral public and competent judges of literary productions that Pope was supreme in poetry and Theobald just as surely the better critic. He expresses this feeling in an epigram entitled *The Judgment of Appollo, on The Controversy between Mr. Pope and Mr. Theobald*, 1729 :

In Pope's melodious Verse the Graces smile,
In Theobald is display'd sagacious Toil;
The Critick's Ivy crowns his subtle brow,
While in Pope's Numbers, Wit and Music flow.

These Bards, so Fortune will'd, were mortal Foes,
And all Parnassus in their Quarrel rose;
This the dire Cause of their contending Rage,
Who best could blanch dark Shakespear's blotted Page.
Apollo heard — and judg'd each Party's Plea,
And thus pronounced th' irrevocable Decree;
Theobald, 't is thine to share what Shakespeare writ,
But Pope shall reign supreme in Poesy and Wit.

It is well to note that an unconcerned observed attributed the quarrel to *Shakespeare Restored*.

Theobald himself did not reply to the attack on him, but in a letter to *Mist's Journal*, June 22, took occasion to comment on *The Dunciad*. In a poetical war of this kind he held that attacks should only be made on the faults in poetry, and that none should be satirized except those who failed as poets. When a writer drew private character into the quarrel and satirized men whose activities lay outside the field of literature, he became a common enemy to mankind and should consider himself lucky if he was not hunted down as a beast of prey. Here Theobald is defending the other "dunces" rather than himself, but he does defend himself against one unjust attack. In a certain passage of the satire Pope accuses Theobald of taking up party writing on the side of the Tories, "cackling to the Tories", as Pope hath it. This representation Theobald characterized, indirectly, as a malevolent lie of angry wit, and he claimed, justly, that his communications to *Mist's Journal* were not concerned with politics but only with learning or entertainment, and he turned the charge of cackling to the Tories against Pope, who, he said, was shrewdly abused or else made a practise of cackling to more than one party.

(To be continued.)

EDWARD B. KOSTER.

Notes and News.

English Association in Holland. The most remarkable feature of the autumn session is the way in which the membership total has increased. From about five hundred on September 1st 1921, it rose to approximately *one thousand and fifty* by January 1st 1922. To a large extent this increase is due to the foundation of two new branches, though on the other hand some of the old have had a very fair share in it. This state of things will enable the Association to undertake work on a larger scale than heretofore.

The foundation of the Nijmegen branch was followed by the constitution, on December 13th, of the Hilversum, or rather Gooi Branch. It started with a membership of over 150. Three days after, on December 16th, the new branch was inaugurated with a lecture by Norman Angell on the topical subject of *The Price to be paid for success at Washington*. The trend of the lecturer's observations will be familiar to readers of his famous pre-war book, 'The Great Illusion'.

Chairman of the Gooi Branch is Mr. P. Roorda, while Mr. J. Veldkamp, 5 Asterstraat, Hilversum, is acting as hon. secretary.

Mr. Compton Mackenzie has had to postpone his tour. In his stead, Mr. Hamilton Fyfe, Special Correspondent of *The Times*, has undertaken to lecture between 3rd—11th February. As announced, Mr. G. K. Chesterton has promised to come between March 27th and April 4th.

Philological Quarterly. Beginning in January, 1922, there will be issued at the University of Iowa the *Philological Quarterly*, a journal devoted to the publication of texts, notes, reviews, and original scholarly articles in the fields of English, Romance, Germanic, Latin, Greek, and Comparative Literature. The Quarterly will be under the editorship of Professor Hardin Craig, head of the department of English at the University of Iowa. He will be assisted by an editorial board consisting of Professor Charles Bundy Wilson, head of the department of German; Associate Professor Charles E. Young, of the department of Romance languages; Professor Berthold L. Ullman, head of the department of Latin and Greek; and Professor Thomas A. Knott, of the department of English.

The productivity of American scholars has long since exceeded the available channels of publication. The *Philological Quarterly* has been founded because it is felt that at present the most effective encouragement of productive scholars is an additional outlet for their productions.

While the subscription price will be set at two dollars a year, the Quarterly will be distributed without charge among all libraries and institutions which are on the exchange list of the University of Iowa Library and for the present, among a limited number of college and university instructors. It is hoped that the journal will, however, prove worthy of the modest support suggested by its subscription price, and will secure enough subscribers to enable it gradually to enlarge its size.

Contributions and business correspondence should be addressed to Professor Hardin Craig, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

Forthcoming articles include: *Some Problems in Renaissance Scholarship*, by Hardin Craig, Professor of English, University of Iowa; *Chaucer's Anonymous Merchant*, by Thomas A. Knott, Professor of English, University of Iowa; *Wudga: A Study in the Theodoric Legends*, by Henning Larsen, Assistant Professor of English, University of Iowa; *Between the Shepherds Calender and the Seasons*, by Elbert N. S. Thompson, Professor of English, University of Iowa.

Max Kaluza †. We regret to announce the death, on December 1, 1921, of Professor Max Kaluza, of the University of Königsberg. He was the last of the three founders and original editors of the *Zs. für franz. und engl. Unterricht*, and well-known for his handbook of historical grammar, and various studies on literature and metrics.

Report A-Examination 1921. *Staatscourant* no. 3, January 3, 1922, includes the report of the examiners for the A-certificate in English in 1921. It contains no remarks worth quoting, except that the average pass percentage (41) was much higher than that for 1920.

Translation.

1. Those who have lived in a town for any length of time can hardly realize how dull it is to have to spend one's life in a village. 2. There everything is planned on a much smaller scale; much that passes unnoticed in a town there attracts general attention; everybody knows everybody more or less or rather think they do, and what happens to the one affords the other matter for conversation. 3. In a town (in one of any importance at least) young people grow up without anybody taking notice of them but their parents and some family friends, whereas villagers are able to recount the character and history of nearly every boy. 4. Thus, everybody knew that Jan B., the son of the schoolmaster, was one of the cleverest and steadiest boys of the village, nay of the whole neighbourhood. 5. Some looked upon him as one of the most gifted lads of the whole country. 6. To those especially, who had seldom if ever left their village, it was as clear as a pikestaff that Jan had not his equal. 7. At the age of five he read fluently whatever came to hand; when fifteen years old he had outstripped his father. 8. Yet Mr. B., the schoolmaster, was a scholar. 9. Those who did not know this, very soon became aware of it. 10. His venerable bald head with its fringe of yellow curls, his spectacles which he pushed up on his forehead just when one would think he most needed them, that is, when he was going to read; his black (frock) coat which he wore day after day, from morning till night; his lean white hands with their inky fingers; his slow walk, his fine way of speaking, every sound clearly and distinctly enunciated, all these traits made the schoolmaster a man of exceptional importance. 11. He even put the clergyman in the shade and the burgomaster was simply nowhere. 12. The only one who might be said to be his equal approximately was the owner of a neighbouring country-seat, at least he possessed a large library and it is generally supposed that something of the contents must have found its way into the mind of the possessor. 13. It was in this library that Jan had continued his studies and had acquired the knowledge and wisdom that his father lacked. 14. It was secretly a source of pride to the owner that properly speaking it was his books that had made Jan what he was. 15. That is why he liked the lad and occasionally carried his kindness so far as to invite him to dinner. 16. During the night preceding such days Jan could hardly get a wink of sleep, and on the day itself he started much too early, for fear of being late.

Observations. 1. *Those who live long (are living long) in a town.* The Present Perfect should be used because of the connexion with the present. — *To pass one's life.* — *To spend his life* is incorrect, as it would refer to a special case. —

2. *Everything is on a much smaller scale. Not: on a m. smaller way. (In a way!)* — *Escapes public notice.* — *Passes unobservedly (unnoticedly).* The adverbial form *unobservedly* is hardly suitable. *Unnoticedly* is not recorded in the dictionaries. — *Arouses general attention (Universal attention).* The beauty and cute behaviour of these creatures attract universal attention. (*Harmsworth Magazine*, 1899, 484). *Excite = wekken* (to excite interest). — *All people — All the people.* The definite article is used after *all* when the following noun would require it without *all*. Compare: "All the boys got a prize" with "All boys like to play". The former sentence is an example of a particular, the latter of a universal proposition. Armed with a permit to see *all the* prisoners (*Strand Magazine*, Nov. 1909, 538). However: I have permission to see *all* parts of the mine. (*Ibid.* Sept 1911, 334). *In town — in the town.* See *E.S.* III, p. 178. *Think to know another (each other).* This construction is wrong because *think* can only be followed by an infinitive in the sense of *expect*. — *Everybody knows everybody or rather think they do.* Not in accordance with strict grammar, but for all that very usual. The want of a personal pronoun of the common gender in the singular led to the use of *they* in this and similar constructions. See Sweet's *Syntax*, § 2101. Purists would write *he* or *he-or-she*. Every one should respect *his* superiors (colloquially: *their* superiors.). Each member of the little group comfortably pursued *his or her* thoughts (Von Hutten: *Pam*, 123). Every one has *their* enemies (Walpole, *Green Mirror*, Book I. Ch. 2). — *What happens to one.* The suppression of the definite article is by no means rare: The commissioner plumped down into a chair and stared from *one* to the other of us (Conan Doyle, *Blue Carbuncle*). As a matter of fact *one* husband was just then bashing the other over the head. (*Wide World Mag.*, 1911, p. 33). In literary or rather rhetorical language the article would seem to be regularly used: Two women shall be grinding at the mill; *the one* shall be taken and the other left (*St. Matthew* 24, 41). The one vanquished by a single blow, the other by efforts successfully repeated. (Goldsmith, *Vicar of Wakefield*). — *Is the subject of conversation to (for) the other.* The dative is very often indicated by the preposition *to* but also by *for*. It is impossible to lay down a definite rule. Examples: *To* a great mind nothing is little (Doyle, *Study in Scarlet*). *To* the pure all is pure (*Bible*). *To* most German Hausfraus the dinners are of paramount importance (*Elizabeth and her German Garden*). *Law to* him was one of those things that every member of an ideal community should have (*Rapid Review*, 1906, p. 126). *To* him the Rector with his shovelhat and stores of scholarship was a godlike man. Quiller-Couch, *Hetty Wesly*, p. 58). I shall be at home *to (for)* nobody. This undertaking spelt ruin *to (for)* him. It means a pound *to (for)* me. I have not an hour *to (for)* myself. In our sentence *to* seems preferable.

3. *While (Whilst) — Whereas.* According to Poutsma, I, § 123, *whereas* has the same meaning as *while*, but is more dignified. Krüger (*Syntax* § 3366) holds that *whereas* marks an emphatic contrast. It is true that *while* implies less of contrast in the parallel, often indeed implying no contrast at all. *Whereas* may open the sentence or introduce the parallel, the latter position is the usual one. — *Of some significance.* Not indefinite enough! We want to express: of any significance, however small. *Any* has strong stress, *some* would be medium- or weak-stressed. — *The youth grow(s) up (are growing*

up). *Youth* may mean 1) the state of being young 2) young people collectively 3) a young man. In the last sense it may have a plural form. In sense 2 it may have a plural or a singular construction (Jespersen, *Syntax*, 4. 94). A plural verb seems to be the rule. Poutsma quotes from Thackeray's *New-comers*: "The innocent dancing *youth* who pressed around her, *were* rather afraid of engaging her". Of course the article is regularly found in this sense. There is no reason why the Periphrastic Form should be used, the continuance of the action not being emphasized. — *Without drawing the attention of anybody*. — *Without anybody minding them* would convey an altogether different idea. — *Besides their parents* is wrong: *besides* includes, *except* excludes. *Besides* the mate three passengers were saved. Nobody was saved *except* the mate. — *Intimate friend* is right. *Friend of the family*, *Housefriend*, not given by N.E.D. or Century Dictionary. The second word I found in Leys, *Wolf in Sheep's Clothing*, p. 193, the third in Pearson's *Magazine*, March 1915, 242. — *The villagers know to tell*. *To know* is no longer immediately followed by the infinitive; *how* is inserted, but even then the rendering does not suit. He knew *how* to tell a good story = was a good story-teller.

4. *The teacher's son*. *Schoolmaster* is better, *teacher* might imply a whole staff. — *Most reliable lads*. — *Aye, of the whole neighbourhood*. — *Surroundings*. The town is pretty and its surroundings are very attractive, the one drawback being a defective watersupply (*Wide World Magazine*, Aug. 1902.). For the difference between *neighbourhood* and *vicinity* see E.S. III, 82.

5. *Some considered him (to be) one of the most gifted lads*. The infinitive may be omitted (Krüger, *Syntax*, § 2556. Poutsma I 230, 566). *Took him for*. N.E.D. observes: Often with implication of error; to mistake for. — *Most accomplished lads*. The word differs from *gifted* in that study and art are combined to produce skill or adroitness. An accomplished painter, poet, musician, orator. *Most talented men*. Rather absurd, seeing that Jan is represented as a boy.

6. *Seldom or ever* is a blending of *seldom or never* and *seldom if ever*. *Never or seldom* is probably the result of translating the Dutch too literally — *It was as sure as eggs is eggs* is a trifle too colloquial — *Was second to none* is correct. *J. did not find his double* = *dubbelganger*.

7. *On his fifth year* makes nonsense. *When five years old* is right. — *Such books as came within his reach*. *Everything he set eyes on*. — *At fifteen he had surpassed his father* = *overtroffen*. *Outwitted his father* = *zijn vader om den tuin geleid*.

8. *A learned man*.

9. *Perceive it on him* is incorrect. You may know a soldier from (by) his bearing. — *That could everyone who did not know it observe directly*. Inversion should not take place in this sentence.

10. *His respectable bald head* is impossible. A respectable merchant. *Respectable Lads Wanted* (advertisement) = *Nette jongens gevraagd*. *His venerable bald skull*. The skull proper is the cranium or brain box. The word is sometimes applied to the head as the seat of intelligence but generally in a disparaging sense: *Skulls that cannot teach, and will not learn*. (Cowper). — *His spectacles which he pushed up to his forehead*. *Moved to his forehead* is not right. *His black frock-coat (dress-coat)*. A frock-coat is what we call een gekleede jas. *Dress-coat (rok)* is out of the question, of course, waiters wear them. *His black frock* is another howler (*jurk, japon*). A priest or clergyman is said to be *unfroked* when he is deprived of ecclesiastical rank. The reference is probably to a monk's frock. —

Clear-skinned implies that the skin is free from blotches. — *Inkstained fingers* is good English. — *His slow gait*.

11. *Overshadowed*. — *The burgomaster could bear no comparison with him*. Mayor is wrong, the chief magistrate of a Dutch or Flemish town is called a burgomaster. (Oxford Dictionary). — When the Doctor tried his hand against the crack shots at Wimbledon Prize meeting he was simply *nowhere*. (*Strand Magazine*, 1894, p. 14). In that year no one talked of anything but the war, cricket and that sort of thing was *nowhere*. (*Ibid.*, Jan. 1915, p. 23). But he had scarcely succeeded in procuring my attendance as a pupil in previous times, and now he was *nowhere* (had hij heelemaal geen kans.) (De Morgan, *Joseph Vance*, Ch. IX.)

12. *Who stood on about a level with him* is quite right. — *The possessor of a neighbouring country house*. A nice distinction is made between *possessor* and *owner* which is well illustrated by the following quotation from Bennett (*Strand Magazine*, Dec. 1916, 668): You may *own* a fine picture, but you will not *possess* it until you can appreciate it. To *own* without possessing is to be a mere figure of ridicule.

13. *Proceeded his study*. *Proceed* is an intransitive verb. We might say: *proceeded with his studies*. The plural *studies* is required. See Krüger, *Syntax*, § 160. *Study* = *Studium* (das studieren). For purposes of *study* this edition is the best. My brother is going to pursue his medical studies at Paris. It is the lads who, like Shelley and R. L. Stevenson, decline to cease to be themselves, who resolutely retain their natural tastes and *pursue the studies* in which they are born to excel, that become men of genius (*Illustrated London News*, Oct. 2, 1909) He pursued his studies, or his amusements, without persecution, molestation or insults (Quoted in N.E.D.) *Continue his studies* is correct. — *The knowledge that his father missed*. Wrong: to *miss* is obsolete in the sense of *to be without*. We miss an article (vermissen), the train (misloopen), a friend (het gemis gevoelen). Have you *missed* any of your cigars lately? (W. H. Osborne, *A Suspicious Character*). *Lack—Want—Need*. Smith (*Synonyms Discriminated*) says that these three form a climax. The superfluities of life — wealth, estates, great power or influence — I *lack*; the conveniences which I am without I *want*; the necessities which I am without I *need*. The Century Dictionary endorses this statement: That which is *lacked* is *generally* a thing which is desirable although *generally* not very important.

14. *In secret the owner considered it an honour*. — *It were his books*. It is taken to be the subject of the sentence; hence *were* should be *was*. — *Made John into what he was*. *To make into* signifies to convert or transform into something different. The peacock was made into a pie. (Irving, *Sketch-book*). Flour is made into bread.

15. *He was fond of the lad*. — *He pushed his kindness so far as to invite him to dinner*. *Carried so far*: But simplicity of style can be carried so far that it degenerates into mere childishness (West, *Elements*, p. 311.). *Ask him to (not: for) dinner*.

16. *Could hardly close his eyes*. — *On the very day* does not fit in here. *Very* is often used in an intensive sense (1), or to emphasize the identity of a thing mentioned with that which was in mind (2): His *very* dog did not know him (zelfs). A quantity of things of the *very* use of which I was ignorant. The very same day. — Neither can *very* be used before "books" in sentence 14. — *In order to be not late*. *Not* should be placed before the infinitive.

Good translations were received from Miss B. M. C., Tilburg; Fr. R. ter E., Oss; Miss M. G., Amsterdam; Miss Annie H., Flushing; Miss D. K., Tilburg; Miss B. J. v. K., Delft; Miss A. M.; Miss R. C. O.; Mr. J. P. P., Rotterdam; Miss A. E. S., Highfield (England); Mr. B. S., Koog-aan-de-Zaan; Miss M. de B. V., Utrecht; Miss A. B. V. v. Z., Hasselt; Mr. B. de W. Moordrecht.

Translations of the following text to be sent to P. J. H. O. Schut, 60 Maarlant, Brielle, before March 1. They will be returned with corrections if accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope.

HET GROOTE WERK.

„Ik weet zeker, dat het je nooit gelukken zal!” Deze woorden had Louise Couvret op eenigszins spottenden toon tot haar man gesproken. Frits zat met gebogen hoofd en verknoede zenuwachtig het met inkt bemorste papier tusschen zijn vingers. Daar kon hij niets op zeggen. Het was zeker al de twintigste keer, dat zijn vrouw deze vervelende opmerking maakte, en het ergste was: hij voelde wel, dat zij gelijk had.

Ja, hij was niet in staat een werk te leveren, waarmee hij zou kunnen uitblinken. Hij moest zich altijd maar bepalen tot middelmatige schetsen of kleine artikelen, die hem opgegeven waren.

Vroeger was er wel eens een roman van hem uitgegeven, en toen had hij zich illusies gemaakt, had hij dien grooten werklust gevoeld en was verder gaan schrijven.

Zijn omgeving had wel vertrouwen in zijn talent, maar die hem bewonderden, zijn moeder, zijn zuster, zijn vrienden, waren mensen, die veel van hem hielden en dus de fouten van zijn werk niet zagen. Alleen zijn vrouw had hem de oogen geopend, door haar minachtende woorden en dien kouden, ironischen blik.

Honderd maal was hij al begonnen aan dat groote werk. Honderd maal had hij woeënd de vellen verscheurd, zich voorpratende, dat het onzin was, wat hij schreef, en dat het beter was, het alles maar in het vuur te werpen. Daar zat hij nu, stil, en zijn gedachten keerden terug naar die gelukkige dagen, weinige helaas in het begin van zijn huwelijk, hun wandelingen door die prachtige laan, met aan weerszijden de bloeiende appelboomen, die heerlijke intieme gesprekken, hun geheel en al opgaan in elkaar...

Nu scheen het hem toe, of hij zijn gegeven woord niet gehouden had, want in de drie jaren, dat hij getrouwd was, had hij zijn belofte aan Louise gedaan niet vervuld, had hij haar teleurgesteld in zijn talent en zijn toekomstdroom — een fortuin misschien.

Langzamerhand was voor Mevrouw Couvret de desillusie gekomen. De mooie plannen, die hij gemaakt had, bleken slechts onvervulbare wenschen te zijn, en in plaats van den rijkdom, dien hij haar had voorgespiegeld, konden ze maar heel eenvoudig leven. „Dat is niet erg, wel, lieveling,” had Frits gezegd, wij zullen er ons wel inschikken, als wij elkaar maar hebben.” Wat gaf hij om de toejuichingen van het publiek, om huldeblijken, nu Louise de zijne was. Maar een schaterlach was het geweest, een lach, die hem verstijfd had.

„Je weet wel, Frits, van liefde alleen kan men niet leven. Dat is goed in de romans, die jij schrijft, of beter, die je denkt te schrijven.”

Toen was in zijn hart iets gebroken.

Reviews.

A Study in Realism. By JOHN LAIRD, M. A., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the Queen's University of Belfast.
— Cambridge University Press. 1920. 14/— net.

Those Dutchmen who hold with Professor Bolland that, owing to its composite structure, English is not an adequate vehicle for philosophic thinking, — and there are disciples of Bolland in every high school and university in Holland — might do worse than put the matter to the test by reading this brightly written and engaging book, in which occur philosophical terms as handy and neat as ever set the heart of a student of language aglow, e.g. 'thinghood' and 'togetherness'. But this delightful side of the

book is only incidental. What the author has set out to do is to prove the tenableness of a philosophy whose fundamental assumption is that things can be known as they really are. The word 'things' in this general statement is to be understood 'in the most general sense possible'. *Any entity whatsoever that can be apprehended by the mind is a 'thing' in this sense, so that rainbows, dream castles, a yearning for Nirvana are included.* But to say that things may be known does not tell us what their reality is. That is a problem for investigation, not something that can be defined in advance, and, of course, there is no implication that knowledge can be satisfied in all its enterprises'. There may be many 'things' the apprehension of which would require the possession of more senses than we have got. And next, our sensory apparatus is unstable, unreliable, contradictory, altogether imperfect. But, as we say in Dutch, one must row with the oars one has got, and the fact that the field which is green to Hodge in his normal condition is yellow to him when he is jaundiced, and has many colours when he is intoxicated, does not justify an assumption that the whole field is only a hallucination, a figment of the brain. 'The senses are our only evidence for the existence of a physical world,' but it is not the realist who has to prove this existence, — it is his opponent, the doubter of sensory testimony, who must prove the non-existence of the world of which his senses tell him.

Now this kind of sailing will appear plain enough, even to people who refuse to admit the author's next point: the 'reality' of the past: 'Recollection appears to be the direct apprehension of the past, and an illustration will show its difference from memory in the sense of reproduction. When Jones asks himself what he recollects of his childhood he does not mean to ask what he learnt in his childhood. He learned to walk and speak, he learned table manners and toilet conventions, but the odds are that he has forgotten how and when he acquired these accomplishments. On the other hand, he can *recollect* specific events. He recollects the arrival of a baby brother, let us say, or some juvenile delinquencies which brought an impressive retribution, together with a few trivial incidents which seem to have clung to him for no reason that he can assign. These events are not habits or repetitions. On the contrary, recollection seems to be the mind's power of returning, again and again, to precisely the same event in the past. These peaks in the past stand out in relief where everything else is a blank or a crapulous haze, and Jones's repeated attention to the same thing is quite different from any habit he may have learnt'. As regards an explanation of the fact of memory itself, Professor Laird refrains from attempting to give one, **saying** any attempt of the kind is bound to be useless. 'Memory is possible, and that is all we need to know,' — and I wonder what Ribot would say to that.

The next chapter deals with fancy and the stuff that dreams are made of. What reality lies behind it all? This introduces a discussion of Freud's theories, which support the writer's general analysis. And if it were possible to explain why there should be any such thing as dramatic portrayal in dream, and how the manifest content of a dream symbolises or expresses a suppressed wish, or desire, or libido, this support would be very strong indeed. Accordingly the writer proceeds to give such an explanation which sounds plausible, but the wording of which I think is somewhat strong. The images and memories of dreams, being present in the day time but relegated then to an obscure or dark background, reveal themselves during sleep, it is true, for want of competitors, but this revelation need not be so *very clear*. There are people who see colours in their dream, there are others who see nothing but greys.

It is not the purpose of my review to give the essence of chapter after chapter. Looking through my copy I perceive many passages underscored — Professor Laird has often a very felicitous way of putting his thoughts — and only a few question marks. I put one for instance on page 113, where we find (in a discussion of 'principle,'): 'I have to arrange my ideas consecutively in order to appreciate the logic in the facts, but this arrangement is not itself *the discovery to which it is a means* (my italics).' Is it really a means to a discovery, I wonder. My notion is that logic, conscious logic, never makes discoveries. It can only verify intuitions, linking them up with what was previously proved. But I did *not* put a note of interrogation opposite the statement enounced on page 138, that 'sentiments are never blind, and reason is neither quite cold nor quite aloof.'

To the chapter on 'values' dealing with taste and beauty and virtue — it seems a pity Edgar Poe should have died before it was written — I intend to return. An attack on Hegel, which has my sympathy but with which I do not propose to deal afterwards, may be noticed here (page 140): 'The community is not a moral being. It is a community of moral beings, and a man owes duties to himself irrespective of the rest of society. Robinson Crusoe did not have to wait for man Friday's coming in order to have duties, and a man's morals are not entirely submerged in his social station... There is nothing subjective in this view, despite Hegel. The thesis of the *Phenomenology* and its successors is that gifts and capacities are not valuable in themselves because (would not the word *since*, preceded by a comma, be preferable? W. v. D.) they may be either good or bad, that their value lies in the rational organisation of them, that the state is just this rational organisation, and so that the bearer of value cannot be anything less than the state. It is an odd thing, perhaps, that a theory which persistently contrasts the unity of the cosmos with the imperfections of the sciences should be so ready to find Reason writ large in politics. Reason must be strong indeed to shine through the muddle and the meannesses, the intrigues, rancour, and pretence of political history; and the philosophers of Hegel's school shut their eyes so often to the facts of history, and so often descry Utopias by faith alone, that their thesis has to be accepted blindly before it can be followed wittingly'.

There is no feud between Prof. Laird and the psychologists. 'Any psychology (page 150) which does not implicitly or of set purpose deny that Smith or Jones may know this or that finally and without qualification is consistent with realism.... My thesis is that we must look to psychology if we wish to know what the mind is, and that there are no sound metaphysical principles which prove that psychological results must be merely provisional. No psychologist or philosopher pretends, of course, that he has obtained complete insight into the mind and its workings, but no sane inquirer makes this pretence in any of the sciences.' — As regards the phenomena of sub-consciousness we find (page 179) as the author's conviction: 'We know enough of the self to be able to scan its main features, and to be justified in believing that the hidden mind is of a piece with the mind that is known.'

The last chapter, called *The Larger Outlook*, develops an admission from which appears pretty clearly that this Study in Realism, which is at the same time a Defence of the same, is to be considered as a kind of *pile-work*. A certain number of stout piles doggedly rammed into marshy soil will, Dutch fashion, have to bear a complete fabric of realistic thought by and by. 'Many idealistic philosophies have at least proved their mettle by grappling resolutely with the high problems they have set themselves. They

have attempted to give a synthesis of art, morals, religion, and the sciences; and they may reasonably claim that intransigent denials and a few forays in the way of pithy argument are not enough to refute them. Moreover, they may claim with some show of reason, that realists have never done their own work thoroughly. Realism claims to be a theory of knowledge, and yet realists have seldom made any systematic attempt to bring the whole of knowledge under review'.

It is evident that Prof. Laird intends to make the attempt. He will have no lack of readers.

WILLEM VAN DOORN.

The Realm of Poetry: An Introduction by STEPHEN J. BROWN
S. J. — Harrap, 1921. —

I cannot but sympathise with the author for wishing to provide lovers of poetry, and especially teachers, with critical insight and canons of taste. As he says in his preface, 'appreciation must grow out of knowledge and understanding,' and 'one does not learn to love and admire poetry by dint of being told how admirable and lovable a thing it is.' A reader should have the courage of his literary convictions, but such courage, to be more than mere *parti pris*, should be based on something better than assertions of individual taste. In the realms of art *de gustibus est disputandum*. On the other hand, even such assertions of personal taste, amounting to nothing more than, 'I like this or that, and there's an end of it,' often refuse to be forthcoming, and the cowardly lover of poetry deserts some well beloved poet, just 'because some supercilious *littérateur* has dismissed him with a disdainful epithet.' Then, too, 'as the reader without knowledge or principles to guide his judgment may be a slave to the critics, so may he be a bondsman to this poet or to that, and the result is not less unfortunate. . . . To no poet must one swear unquestioning allegiance. Homer has sometimes nodded, Wordsworth and Victor Hugo have written a great deal of rubbish.'

It is not difficult to subscribe to these statements, while maintaining that the first section of the book under review — dealing with the nature of poetry — is only a very partial success, the cause being that the author (in Wordsworthian phrase) has put himself too much to school, 'nor dares to move unpropped upon the staff' of his own critical intellect. He has read many books on poetry and poetics, and the different views he has found in them he has pieced together rather than fused into one whole. Is Santayana, quoted on page 35, right where he says that, 'fine art, in this as in all other things, imitates the method of Nature and makes its most beautiful works out of materials that are themselves beautiful'? I say he is not. Rosy and pink being admittedly prettier colours than black, it would follow that Rembrandt's negro in the Wallace Collection should as a work of art be accounted inferior to the baker's dozen of insipidly pretty Greuzes that find themselves there too, quite evidently by mistake. And though I shall not deny that there are decidedly ugly words which no poet can have a use for — cemetery, for instance, as compared with grave-yard — I hold that the bulk of the vocabulary of any language is aesthetically *neutral*, neither fine nor ugly in itself, but deriving its aesthetic values from context and setting. Let me exemplify this by comparing two lines from a well-known poem by Browning. The fifth line of the second stanza of *How They Brought the Good News from Ghent to Aix* reads:

'Rebuckled the cheek-strap, chained slacker the bit'.

The fourth line of the seventh stanza runs:

'Neath our feet broke the brittle bright stubble like chaff'.

Now, taken by themselves these two lines are about equally harsh, in fact there is little to choose between them. But whereas number one must stand convicted of splintering our teeth *without having any business to do so*, number two is admirably suggestive. It follows that of two lines of verse of equal harshness the one must be called ugly and the other fine. But on the subject of Browning the author and myself seem unable to see eye to eye, and he disapproves of *Soliloquy of the Spanish Cloister*, which I think a marvel of psychological insight adequately expressed.

The Rev. Brown's ear appears to be defective, where he *hears* an alliteration in 'His careering chariot steeds', because he *sees* two successive words spelled with the same initial letter. This sort of thing won't do. Where is the internal rime which the line '*What message dost thou bring?*' is alleged to contain? On page 86, where the pantoum — as in Gailey and Kurtz! — is numbered among old French verse-forms, the author states that Chaucer's *Troilus* and James Thomson's *To Our Ladies of Death* are both written in Rime Royal. Well, here follows a stanza from Chaucer's poem:

To thee clepe I, thou Goddesse torment,
Thou cruel Furie, sorwing evere in payne!
Help me that am the sorwful instrument
That helpeth lovers, as I can, to pleyne!
For well sit it, the sothe for to seyne,
A woful wight to han a drery fere,
And to a sorwful tale, a sory chere!

This is Rime Royal, the rime-scheme being ababbcc, but Thomson's pattern gives ababccb. Compare:

Over me pass the days and months and years
Like squadrons and battalions of the foe
Trampling with thoughtless thrusts and alien jeers
Over a wounded soldier lying low:
He grips his teeth, or flings them words of scorn
To mar their triumph: but the while, outworn,
Inwardly craves for death to end his woe.

In the second part of his book the author discusses the much-vexed question 'What can poetry do for us?' He finds many more or less satisfactory answers, and has my whole-hearted support where he says — and to me the saying appears to bear the stamp of originality: "It is useful, is it not, that we should think rightly: philosophy and science teach us that. Is it not likewise useful that we should feel genuinely? — Poetry helps to that."

Acting on this excellent principle, the Rev. Mr. Brown proceeds, in a third section, to unfold his ideas about *Learning to Love Poetry*, which of course implies *Teaching Young People to do so*. For this section I have little but praise, and for its sake I recommend the book very warmly, especially to those teachers of English on the Continent who are convinced that the time for confining one's 'literary' activities at school to *Enoch Arden* and *A Psalm of Life* ought to be past.

W. v. D.

The Sacred Wood. Essays on Poetry and Criticism. By T. S. ELIOT. — Methuen, 1920. — 6/— net.

Mr. Eliot, whose critical attitude towards life and letters often prevents him from being a very remarkable poet, is an exceedingly clever man. Indeed I once heard an English man of letters describe his cleverness as something *uncanny*, and say that, if the U. S. A. hold many like him, we poor worn-out and effete Europeans had better take a hint from Desiderio the Lombard King when beleaguered by Charlemagne.

"Let us go down,

And hide us in the bosom of the earth....!"

Mr. Eliot also detests reviewers, whom he has publicly proclaimed to be a nuisance. And yet his collection of essays, some of which appeared before, in the same or a more primitive form in papers like *The Athenæum* and *The Times Literary Supplement*, finds itself upon my desk and I am called upon to review it.

The Sacred Wood is a good book, instructive (sometimes destructively so) and stimulating. Let me cull some sayings worth meditating on:

"Once a poet is accepted, his reputation is seldom disturbed, for better or worse." (xii). "Arnold.... gives us often the impression of seeing the masters whom he quotes, as canonical literature, rather than as masters." (xiv, note). "It would be of interest to divagate from literature to politics and inquire to what extent Romanticism is incorporate in Imperialism; to inquire to what extent Romanticism has possessed the imagination of Imperialists.... But there may be a good deal to be said for Romanticism in life, there is no place for it in letters." (28).

"The Arts insist that a man shall dispose of all that he has, even of his family tree, and follow art alone. For they require that a man be not a member of a family or of a caste or of a party or of a coterie, but simply and solely himself.... There is only one man better and more uncommon than the patrician, and that is the Individual." (28).

"No poet, no artist of any art, has his complete meaning alone. His significance, his appreciation is the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists. You cannot value him alone; you must set him, for contrast and comparison, among the dead. I mean this as a principle of aesthetic, not merely historical, criticism.... the poet who is aware of this will be aware of great difficulties and responsibilities. In a peculiar sense he will be aware also that he must inevitably be judged by the standards of the past. I say judged, not amputated, by them not judged to be as good as, or worse or better than, the dead; and certainly not judged by the canons of dead critics.... He must be quite aware of the obvious fact that art never improves, but that the material of art is never quite the same." (44—46).

"When [oxygen and sulphur dioxide] are mixed in the presence of a filament of platinum, they form sulphurous acid. This combination takes place only if the platinum is present; nevertheless the newly formed acid contains no trace of platinum, and the platinum itself is apparently unaffected; has remained inert, neutral, and unchanged. The mind of the poet is the shred of platinum. It may partly or exclusively operate upon the experience of the man himself; but, the more perfect the artist, the more completely separate in him will be the man who suffers and the mind which creates; the more perfectly will the mind digest and transmute the passions which are its material." (48).

"We must believe that "emotion recollected in tranquillity" is an inexact formula. For it is neither emotion, nor recollection, nor, without distortion of meaning, tranquillity. It is a concentration, and a new thing resulting from the concentration, of a very great number of experiences which to the practical and active person would not seem to be experiences at all, it is a concentration which does not happen consciously or of deliberation . . . of course this is not quite the whole story. There is a great deal, in the writing of poetry, which must be conscious and deliberate. In fact, the bad poet is usually unconscious where he ought to be conscious, and conscious where he ought to be unconscious." (52).

"[Swinburne's] diffuseness is essential, had [he] practised greater concentration his verse would be, not better in the same kind, but a different thing You could not condense *The Triumph of Time*. You could only leave out. And this would destroy the poem; though no one stanza seems essential." (132).

"Blake's beginnings as a poet . . . are as normal as the beginnings of Shakespeare. His method of composition, in his mature work, is exactly like that of other poets. He has an idea (a feeling, an image), he develops it by accretion or expansion, alters his verse often, and hesitates often over the final choice. The idea, of course, simply comes, but upon arrival it is subjected to prolonged manipulation." (139).

I am not going to discuss the above sayings. Most of them, indeed, I can readily endorse. I have culled them chiefly that the readers of E. S. might have a notion of the contents of this book, which those who want enlightenment on such subjects as *Blank Verse*, *The Poetic Drama*, *Rhetoric &c* will do well to read. Written from the point of view of a professional it is frankly partisan and not a thing to swallow whole, like an approved manual written by a pundit of unchallenged authority. It will set one thinking, and even where it fails to convince it will clear away cobwebs. It might be read with some profit by certain Dutch critics that shall be nameless, gushing worshippers of 'the unconscious' and writers of involved sentences that, for all their would be depth, are my heart's abhorrence. But *they* will never glance at a book that is so entirely without cant, so level-headed. I trust, however, that among the readers of E. S. there will be some who will do more than glance.

W. v. D.

Epilegomena to the Study of Greek Religion: by JANE ELLEN HARRISON, Fellow and Lecturer of Newnham College, Cambridge — Cambr. Un. Press. 1921. — 3/6.

This brief review is preliminary to an article which I propose to contribute to this year's *English Studies*, and in which I also intend to deal at some length with Miss Weston's theories on the origin of the legend of the Grail (*From Ritual to Romance*, Cambridge. 1920. —12/6). I notice that the learned author's standpoint has not been appreciably shifted, notwithstanding the vehement attacks made by euhemerists like Sir William Ridgeway on the theories of which Sir James Frazer remains the great exponent. To *littérateurs* of the older school it may seem the height of madness that one should study the barbarous practices of primitive peoples to obtain a clearer insight into matters religious, literary and sociological, but even in the present stage of our knowledge, with plenty of questions still unan-

swered and plenty of points unelucidated, such studies have already yielded splendid results.

Miss Harrison's *Epilegomena* — the *Prolegomena* appeared as early as 1903¹⁾ — consist of three chapters, which, besides giving the gist of her previous works on Greek religion, contain some new material based on the recent psychological work of Jung and Freud. The first chapter deals with primitive ritual, including the important initiation ceremonies and the fertility play, the second with primitive 'theology' ('what ritual expresses in action theology utters in concomitant representation'), the third with the author's conception of *The Religion of To-day* ('via crucis via lucis') 'The instincts are good and remain the prime motors to thought. The personal emotions are good, the best of which the spiritually undeveloped are capable, yet in the exercise of these you but strengthen your selfhood. But in science, that is the disinterested search after truth, in art which is creative self-absorption, you lose yourself in something bigger and more permanent and these henceforth rank as of the highest religious value.'

W. v. D.

Bibliography.

POETRY, FICTION, DRAMA.

Pearl. An English poem of the Fourteenth Century. Edited, with modern rendering, together with Boccaccio's "Olympia," by SIR ISRAEL GOLLANCZ. 6¾ × 5, lii. + 285 p.p. Chatto and Windus. 1922. 7s. 6d. n. [A review will appear.]

Fourteenth Century Verse and Prose. Edited by KENNETH SISAM. 7¾ × 5¼, xlvii. + 292 pp. Oxford 1921. 7s. 6d. n. [A review will appear.]

The Wheatley Manuscript. A Collection of Middle English Verse and Prose contained in a MS. now in the British Museum. Add. MSS. 39,574. Edited with introduction and notes by MABEL DAY. 8¾ × 5¾, xxxii. + 125 pp. For the Early English Text Society. Milford. 1921. 30 s. net.

The contents of this volume have been transcribed from a MS. belonging to the beginning of the fifteenth century, and containing some poems hitherto unknown, among them a "Hymn to St. John the Baptist", which is given here. All the pieces in the volume are religious, and include "An Orison on the Passion", a "Prayer to the Blessed Virgin", a metrical version of the "Seven Penitential Psalms", and a "Prayer at the Elevation" in the Mass. [T.]

Metaphysical Lyrics and Poems of the Seventeenth Century. Donne to Butler. Selected and Edited with an Essay by HERBERT J. C. GRIERSON. 7¾ × 5¼, lviii. + 244 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 1921. 6s. net.

Minor Poets of the Caroline Period. Vol. III. Edited by GEORGE SAINTSBURY, M.A. 8¾ × 5¼, 551 pp. Oxford, 1921. 16s. net.

The two first volumes of this important work were published 1905-1906. The present volume, which concludes the work, deals with John Cleveland, Thomas Stanley, Henry King, Thomas Flatman, and Nathaniel Whiting. [T.]

COWPER, Poetry and Prose. With Essays by HAZLITT and BAGEHOT. With an Introduction and Notes by HUMPHREY S. MILFORD. Crown 8vo, pp. 196. Clarendon Press, 1921, 3/6 n.

The Poems of William Blake. Edited and arranged with a preface by JOHN SAMPSON. 8¼ × 6¼, xxxviii. + 344 pp. Chatto and Windus. 1921. 15s. net.

Poems: 1916-1920. By JOHN MIDDLETON MURRY. 8¾ × 5½, 67 pp. R. Cobden-Sanderson. 6s. net.

Some of these poems appeared in the *Nation* and the *Athenaeum*. Others are from a volume privately printed under the title "Poems: 1917-1918"

Seeds of Time. By JOHN DRINKWATER. 7¼ × 5, 74 pp. Sidgwick and Jackson. 3s. 6d. n.

The Veil and other Poems. By WALTER DE LA MARE. 7¾ × 5½, viii. + 92 pp. Constable. 6s.

An English Anthology of Prose and Verse. By SIR HENRY NEWBOLT. Dent. 1921. 10/6 n.

¹⁾ The book, which is out of print, appears to be hardly known in Holland. There is a copy in de Koninklijke Bibliotheek, The Hague; there is none in the library of Amsterdam University, which, however, boasts of a complete third edition of *The Golden Bough*.

An Anthology of Recent Poetry. Compiled by L. D'O. WALTERS. Harrap, 1920. 10/6 net. [A review will appear.]

A Book of English Verse on Infancy and Childhood. Chosen by L. S. WOOD. Macmillan, 1921. 3/6 net.

A Book of Women's Verse. Edited, with a Prefatory Essay, by J. C. SQUIRE. Clarendon Press, 1921. 7/6 net.

Modern American Poetry. By L. UNTERMEYER. An Anthology of Verse by some 100 writers from 1830 to the present day. New York, Harcourt; London, Jonathan Cape, 1921. 8/6 net. [A review will appear.]

English Prose. Chosen and arranged by W. PEACOCK. In five volumes. Volume III. Walpole to Lamb. (The World's Classics Series.) 6¼ × 4. x. + 552 pp. Milford. 2s. 6d. n.

The Scottish Chiefs. By JANE PORTER. Edited by KATE DOUGLAS WIGGIN and NORA A. SMITH. Illustrated by N. C. WYETH. 9¼ × 7¼, xvi. + 503 p.p. Hodder and Stoughton. 16 s. net.

A Christmas Carol in Prose. By CHARLES DICKENS. With an introduction and notes by E. KRUSINGA. 2nd edition. Kemink, 1921. f 1.60.

To Let. By JOHN GALSWORTHY. Heinemann, 1921. 7/- net.

The Confession of Ursula Trent: Ten Years of a Woman's Life. By W. L. GEORGE. Chapman & Hall, 1921. 8/6 net.

Crome Yellow. By ALDOUS HUXLEY. Chatto & Windus, 1921. 7/6 net.

The Young Enchanted. A Romantic Story. By HUGH WALPOLE. Macmillan, 1921. 8/6 n.

Coquette. By FRANK SWINNERTON. Methuen, 1921. 7/6 net.

Joanna Godden. By SHEILA KAYE-SMITH. 7¾ × 5¼. 316 pp. Cassell. 8 s. 6 d. net.

Mr. Waddington of Wyck. By MAY SINCLAIR. Cassell, 1921. 7/6 net.

Rich Relatives. By COMPTON MACKENZIE. 7¾ × 5¼, 301 p.p. Martin Secker. 9 s. net.

Jurgen: A Comedy of Justice. By JAMES BRANCH CABELL. With Illustrations by Frank C. Papé and an Introduction by Hugh Walpole. John Lane, 1921. 25/- net.

Romeo and Juliet. A photographic reproduction of Luigi da Porto's prose version of "Romeo and Giulietta", dated 1535, being the original source of Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet. With a literal translation into English from the Italian. Also a photographic reproduction of the 1539 edition. With full bibliography and introductory remarks by MAURICE JONAS. 7¾ × 5, Davis and Orioli. 21 s. net.

The translation is made from the edition of 1535 in the British Museum; the 1539 facsimile from a copy in the possession of the author.

The Merry Wives of Windsor. By WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE. Edited by SIR ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH and JOHN DOVER WILSON. Cambridge University Press, 1921. Cloth, 8/- net; Leather, 10/6 net.

The Captives, or The Lost Recovered. Written by THOMAS HEYWOOD. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Glossary, by ALEXANDER CORBIN JUDSON. 9 × 6½, 175 pp. Newhaven: Yale University Press. London: Milford. 1921. 12 s. 6 d. net.

The text of *The Captives* was first printed by the late A. H. Bullen (who found the MS.) in 1885 in a limited edition. Mr. Judson, working from a rotograph of the manuscript, has been able to decipher several passages of the difficult handwriting which baffled Mr. Bullen and to offer various alternative readings. These, together with a critical introduction and notes, are published, in a very attractively got-up volume, under the auspices of the Elizabethan Club, Yale University. [T.]

The Rehearsal: a comedy by GEORGE VILLIERS, 2nd Duke of Buckingham. Edited with introduction and notes by CHARLES PERROMAT. [Privately printed; to be consulted at the Sorbonne Library.]

Restoration Comedies. With an Introduction and Notes by MONTAGUE SUMMERS. Jonathan Cape. 1921. 15 s. net.

Gruach and Britain's Daughter. Two plays by GORDON BOTTOMLEY. 9 × 7, 124 pp. Constable. 15 s. net.

The Plays of Hubert Henry Davies. With an introduction by HUGH WALPOLE. In two volumes. 8½ × 5¾, Vol. I., xxi. + 282 pp.; Vol. II., 237 pp. Chatto and Windus. 25 s. net each.

Hubert Henry Davies, author of the well-known comedies, *Mrs. Gorrington's Necklace*, *Cousin Kate*, *Captain Drew on Leave*, and *The Mollusc*, was born in 1869 and died in 1917, after strenuous war-work at hospitals in Paris and elsewhere. [T.]

The Old Lady Shows Her Medals. By J. M. BARRIE. 7½ × 5. 168 pp. Hodder and Stoughton. 5 s. net.

Four of Sir James Barrie's War Plays.

Six Short Plays by JOHN GALSWORTHY. Duckworth, 1921. 5/— net. [A review will appear.]

Oliver Cromwell. A play by JOHN DRINKWATER. 7½ × 5¼, 80 pp. Sidgwick and Jackson. 3 s. 6 d. net.

Four Plays for Dancers. By W. B. YEATS. With illustrations by Edmund Dulac. Macmillan, 1921.

If. A play in four acts. By LORD DUNSANY. 7¼ × 5, 160 pp. Putnams. 3 s. 6 d. n.
The play running until October 29 at the Ambassadors Theatre.

The Cockpit. By ISRAEL ZANGWILL. Romantic drama in three acts. 8¼ × 5½, 258 pp. Heinemann. 5 s. net.

A drama of the friction of races in the old world, following on the author's well-known drama on the fusion of races in the New World called, *The Melting Pot*. [T]

Possession. A peep-show in Paradise. By LAURENCE HOUSMAN. 7¾ × 5, 62 pp. Jonathan Cape. 2 s. 6 d. net and 3 s. 6 d. net.

This was first published in a limited edition at 7 s. 6 d.

Tales, Songs, and Plays of the Ridings. Being the collected dialect works of the late F. W. MOORMAN. 7¾ × 5½, 336 pp. Elkin Mathews. 9 s. net.

The late Professor Moorman's Yorkshire dialect writings gained him a sure reputation; and many will be glad to have bound up in one volume his "Tales of the Ridings" (with Professor Vaughan's Memoir, 1920) "More Tales of the Ridings" (1920), "Songs of the Ridings" (1918), and "Plays of the Ridings" (1919). [T]

TAUCHNITZ REPRINTS.

- | | |
|--|----------|
| 4550. <i>Tony the Exceptional</i> . By W. E. NORRIS. | } Sewed |
| 4551. <i>The Plain Man and his Wife</i> . By ARNOLD BENNETT. | |
| 4552. <i>Misalliance</i> . With a Treatise on Parents and Children. By BERNARD SHAW. | |
| 4553. <i>Cabbages and Kings</i> . By O. HENRY. | |
| 4554. <i>Tarzan of the Apes</i> . By EDGAR RICE BURROUGHS. | |
| 4555. <i>Fanny's First Play</i> — <i>Great Catherine</i> — <i>Annajanska</i> — <i>Overruled</i> . By BERNARD SHAW. | } Boards |
| 4556. <i>The Return of Tarzan</i> . By EDGAR RICE BURROUGHS. | |
| 4557. <i>About Many Things</i> . By GRACE RHYS. | } Cloth |
| 4558. <i>The Home and the World</i> . By RABINDRANATH TAGORE. | |
| 4559. <i>The Gardener</i> . Poems of Love and Life. By RABINDRANATH TAGORE. | |
| 4560. <i>Sādhana</i> . By RABINDRANATH TAGORE. | |
| 4561. <i>Friendship and Happiness</i> and other essays. By ARNOLD BENNETT. | |

HISTORY OF LITERATURE, CRITICISM.

Beowulf. An introduction to the study of the poem, with a discussion of the stories of Offa and Finn. By R. W. CHAMBERS. 9¼ × 6¼, xii. + 417 pp. Cambridge University Press. 30 s. net.

A substantial investigation of the whole problem of this unique Anglo-Saxon MS, discussing the various theories of the origin, date, and structure of the poem with much learning, and bringing a mass of documentary evidence to bear upon the question. There is an elaborate bibliography and eight illustrative plates. A review will appear.

A Short History of English Literature. By ARCHIBALD T. STRONG, Associate-Professor of English language and literature in the University of Melbourne. Milford, 1921. Cr. 8vo, cloth, pp. xii. + 404. 8/6 net.

Poetic Origins and the Ballad. By LOUISE FOUNT. Macmillan Cy., 1921. \$ 2.50. [A review will appear.]

English Pageantry. By R. WITHINGTON. 2 vols. I, with 13 full-page illustrations, cr. 4to, 17/— net. II, with 21 illustrations, 8vo. 25/— net. Milford, 1921. For Harvard Univ. Press.

Carols. Their origin, music, and connection with mystery-plays. By WILLIAM J. PHILLIPS. With a foreword by SIR FREDERICK BRIDGE. 8¾ × 7, xv. + 134 pp. Routledge. 6 s. net.

The Laureateship. A study of the office of Poet Laureate in England with some account of the poets. By EDMUND KEMPER BROADUS. 9¼ × 6, vii. + 239 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 15 s. net.

Le Morte d'Arthur of Sir Thomas Malory. A study of the book and its sources. By VIDA D. SCUDDER. 8 × 5½, xii. + 430 pp. Dent. 10 s. 6 d. net.

By an American professor of English Literature (Wellesley College).

Tudor Ideals. By LEWIS EINSTEIN. Bell and Sons, 1921. 14/— net.

Shakespeare's Treatment of Love and Marriage, and other essays. By C. H. HERFORD. 9 × 6, 201 pp. Fisher Unwin, 1921. 10 s. 6 d. net.

Giovanni Florio; un apôtre de la Renaissance en Angleterre à l'époque de Shakespeare. Par LONGWORTH CHAMBRUN. Paris, Payot, 1921. 20 fr. [A review will appear.]

Literary Culture in Early New England, 1620-1730. By F. G. WRIGHT. 8vo. pp. 322. Oxford University Press, 1921. 25 s. net.

William Wycherley, sa vie, son oeuvre. Par CHARLES PERROMAT. Paris, Félix Alcan, 1921.

Life and Letters of John Gay. (1685-1732.) By LEWIS MELVILLE. 8¾ × 5¾, xii. + 167 pp. Daniel O'Connor. 8s. 6d. net.

Matthew Prior: a study of his public career and correspondence. By L. G. WICKHAM LEGG. 9¼ × 6, x. + 348 pp. Cambridge University Press, 1921.

The Abbé Prévost and English literature. By G. R. HAVENS. Princeton, University Press, and Paris, Champion, 1921.

England and the Englishman in German literature of the eighteenth century. By J. A. KELLY. New York, Columbia University Press, 1921.

The Life of William Cowper. By THOMAS WRIGHT. Second Edition. 8¾ × 5¾, viii. + 368 pp. Farncombe. 12s. 6d. net.

First published 1892. Much new matter has come to hand since then: particularly many letters — those which Mr. Wright included in his four-volume work "The Correspondence of William Cowper" and others. [T.]

La poésie de la nuit et des tombeaux en Europe au XVIIIe siècle. Par P. VAN TIEGHEM. Paris, Rieder, 1921.

The Truth about Burns. By D. McNAUGHT. 8 × 5¼, xi. + 246 pp. Glasgow: Maclehose Jackson. 7s. 6d. net.

Dr. McNaught is the editor of the *Burns Chronicle*, and in this condensed biography he gathers together evidence which has appeared in its columns. [T.]

Ann Radcliffe, in Relation to her Time. By CLARA F. MCINTYRE. Yale Studies in English. No. 62. Oxford University Press, 1921. 8vo. pp. 108. 6s. 6d. net.

The Early Life of William Wordsworth. By EMILE LEGOUIS. Translated by J. W. MATTHEWS. Dent. 10/6 net.

Lord Byron, Arnold, and Swinburne. By PROFESSOR H. J. C. GRIERSON. 9¾ × 6, 31 pp. Humphrey Milford. 2s. net.

This is the Warton Lecture on English Poetry. It is a critical appreciation, by a warm admirer, of the poetry of Byron, starting from the pronouncement made by Matthew Arnold in 1881 in his "Poetry of Byron"; that "Wordsworth and Byron stand first and pre-eminent in actual performance, a glorious pair, among the English poets of this century" — a pronouncement in reply to which Swinburne championed the names of Coleridge and Shelley. [T.]

Byron. Par PAUL DE REUL. Professeur à l'Université de Bruxelles. (Extrait de la Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles. Mai-Juin, 1921.) [A review will appear.]

Le Centenaire de Keats. Par PAUL DE REUL. (Extrait du *Flambeau*, Nov. 1921.) Bruxelles, 1921. [A review will appear.]

PEACOCK'S *Four Ages of Poetry*. — SHELLEY'S *Defence of Poetry*. — BROWNING'S *Essay on Shelley*. — Edited by H. F. B. BRETT-SMITH. 7⅞ × 5½, xxxiii. + 112 pp. Basil Blackwell. 4s. 6d. net.

The editor claims that this is the first time Peacock's "Four Ages of Poetry" (1820) has been published in one volume with Shelley's answer, "The Defence of Poetry" (1840). Browning's "Essay on Shelley", which is here appended, was printed in 1852 as an introduction to a volume of alleged Shelley letters, published in good faith by Edward Moxon, which were afterwards shown to be, all but two of them, forgeries. Introduction, bibliographical notes, and explanatory notes, 20 pp. [T.]

Three Studies in Shelley. And an essay on nature in Wordsworth and Meredith. By ARCHIBALD T. STRONG. 9¼ × 6. 189 pp. Milford. 10s. 6d. net.

The Formation of Tennyson's Style. A study, primarily, of the versification of the early poems. By J. F. A. PYRE, Associate Professor of English. 9¾ × 6½, 252 pp. Madison: University of Wisconsin.

Die Englische Literatur der Neuesten Zeit, von Dickens bis Shaw. Von DR. LEON KELLNER. Leipzig, Tauchnitz, 1921. [A review will appear.]

Samuel Butler: A Sketch by HENRY FESTING JONES. 7 × 4½, 60 pp. Jonathan Cape. 2s. 6d. n.

This little book by the author of "Samuel Butler: A Memoir," belongs to "the Life and Colour Series". The sketch first appeared in "The Humour of Homer and Other Essays," 1913.

Memories and Notes of Persons and Places, 1852-1912. By SIR SIDNEY COLVIN. 9 × 6, 327 pp. Arnold. 18s. n.

Thomas Hardy. Poet and Novelist. By SAMUEL C. CHEW. 3¾ × 4¼, viii. + 257 pp. Pennsylvania: Bryn Mawr College. Longmans. \$ 1.50.

One of the (American) "Bryn Mawr Notes and Monographs by the Professor of English Literature in Bryn Mawr College".

Thomas Hardy. A study of Wessex novels. Second edition, with an appendix on the Poems and The Dynasts by H. C. DUFFIN. $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$, 240 pp. Manchester: University Press. London: Longmans. 7s. 8d. n.

First edition 1916.

Bibliographies of Modern Authors. By HENRY DANIELSON. 9×6 , xi. + 211 pp. *The Bookman's Journal*, 12s. 6d. n.

Most of this appeared in the *Bookman's Journal*. It gives collations of the first editions of Max Beerbohm, Rupert Brooke, H. Crackanthorpe, W. de la Mare, John Drinkwater, Lord Dunsany, J. E. Flecker, Gissing, Ledwidge, Compton Mackenzie, Masefield, L. Merrick, R. Middleton, Arthur Symonds, and Hugh Walpole. [I.]

Bibliographies of Modern Authors. No. 3: George Moore. $7\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$, 13 pp. Leslie Chaundy. 1s. 6d. net.

This is based on a bibliography which appeared in the *London Mercury*.

Le Roman Anglais de notre Temps. By ABEL CHEVALLEY. $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, xii. + 256 pp. Milford. 8s. 6d. net.

Euripides and Shaw, with other Essays. By GILBERT NORWOOD. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, vii. + 226 pp. Methuen, 1921. 7s. 6d. net.

The World of the Theatre. By J. T. GREIN. Heinemann, 1921. 6/- net.

The Realm of Poetry. An introduction by STEPHEN J. BROWN. S. J. Harrap, 1921. [See Review.]

More Essays on Books. By A. CLUTTON-BROCK. vii. + 174 pp. Methuen. 6s. net.

A further instalment of essays which Mr. Clutton-Brock has contributed to *The Times Lit. S.*

The Second Person Singular and other essays. By ALICE MEYNELL. Milford, 1921. 6/- n.

The "other essays" include: *Strictly an Elizabethan Lyrist*, Joanna Baillie, *The Classic Novelist*, Coventry Patmore, George Meredith, *Pessimism in Fiction*, etc.

PERIODICALS.

Leuvense Bijdragen. Tijdschrift voor Moderne Philologie. XIII, 1. 1921. Includes A. J. Carnoy, The Semasiology of American and other Slangs. — Reviews.

Englische Studien. 55, 3. (Oct. 1921), H. Knüpfner, Die Anfänge der periphrastischen Komparation im englischen (Heidelberg Dissertation). — F. Kläeber, Zu Byrhtnoðs Tod. — Eilert Ekwall, Some Notes on the History of Early English Pronunciation. — Reviews. — Notes and News.

Neuere Sprachen. XXIX, 7/8 (Oct.-Nov. 1921). Kurt Glaser, Zum bedeutungswandel im französischen. — Fritz Karpf, Syntaxstudien I (Notes on Modern English syntax, with special reference to Jespersen's *Syntax*). — Notes. — Reviews.

Beiblatt zur Anglia. 32, 12 (Dec. 1921). Reviews, including Fehr on *Trois Etudes de littérature anglaise* (Kipling, Galsworthy, Shakespeare et l'Âme anglaise) by Chevrillon.

Zeitschrift für franz. und engl. Unterricht. 20, 4. Gunther, Neusprachlicher unterricht, schülerbibliothek und auslandskunde. — Sanftleben, Zum deutschen und fiemdsprachlichen schulaufsatz. — Arns, Englische theatermissstände und reformpläne. — Notes. — Reviews¹⁾. There is a note on the death of its last remaining editor Professor Kaluza by his successor Dr. Hermann Jantzen.

Modern Language Notes. XXXVI, 8. Dec. 1921. R. C. Williams, Metrical Form of the Epic, as discussed by 16th century critics. — G. Guillaume, The Prologues of *Loy le Freine* and *Sir Orfeo*. — J. Hankiss, Schelandre et Shakespeare. — A. D. McKillop, Some early traces of Rabelais in English literature. — S. H. Cox, Chaucer's cheerful cynicism.

Revue de Littérature Comparée. I, 4. Oct.-Dec. 1921. A. Morel-Fatio, El puñal en la liga ("le poignard dans la jarrettière"). — P. de Nolhac, Un poète rhénan ami de la Pléiade. II. Paul Melissus en Italie. — P. Dimoff, Une source anglaise de l'*Invention* d'André Chénier. — H. Tronchon, Herder et Lamartine. — G. Roth, Kirke White et "Joseph Delorme". — P. Martino, Sur deux poèmes musulmans de Leconte de Lisle.

Id. II, 1. Janvier-Mars 1922. F. Baldensperger, Où l'Orient et l'Occident s'affrontent. — P. de Nolhac, Un poète rhénan ami de la Pléiade. III. Paul Melissus à Paris. — P. Toldo, *Le Moine bridé*: à propos d'un conte de Piron. — J. Lescoffier, Une adaptation de Victor Hugo par Björnson. — P. Trahard, Les sources de l'*Amour africain* dans le *Théâtre de Clara Gazul*. — Notes et Documents (including E. Allison Peers, The earliest notice of Byron in Spain).

¹⁾ Messrs. Teubner make the welcome announcement that they have re-established fixed prices and made arrangements to enable all booksellers to deliver the books at the published prices (catalogue of July 1921) For Holland the prices are trebled (200 % 'valuta ausgleich').

Lewis Theobald.

II.

Whilst Theobald was contemplating the publication of critical and explanatory remarks upon Shakespeare in three octavo volumes at the price of one guinea, Pope's second edition of Shakespeare appeared in November 1728. Theobald's emendations had met with such a wide acceptance that Pope felt compelled to introduce some of them into the text. This he did with poor grace, failing to acknowledge some and cavilling at others. At the end of the eighth volume he made a general acknowledgment of the aid he had received from Theobald, estimating it at twenty-five words introduced into the text, and added several pages of his opponent's corrections, on the ground that if thought trivial or wrong, they could at worst spoil only half a sheet that happened to be vacant. He also brought the charge against Theobald that although he publicly advertised for the assistance of all lovers of Shakespeare, while his edition was preparing for the press, yet this critic would not communicate his notes. He ended with a slur at Theobald's ability to correct errors of the press.

The latter was not slow to reply to this misrepresentation. In a letter to the *Daily Journal*, November 26, 1728, he called to mind the assurance he gave in *Mist's Journal* that he would be able to give over five hundred emendations that Pope and all his assistants would miss. He claimed that instead of Pope's accepting twenty-five of his readings, he had really adopted about one hundred.¹⁾ He proceeded to name, negatively, five qualities of an editor of Shakespeare: industry in collating, knowledge of history, knowledge of modern tongues, judgment in digesting text, and judgment in restoring it. Pope's deficiency in all these made him absolutely unequal to the task of editing. He also proved his assertion by citing examples where Pope had failed in each of the stated qualities. As regards Pope's complaint of his not communicating his notes, he said he considered it rash to bestow the labour of twelve years' study upon a bookseller to whom he owed no obligations, or an editor who was likely to prove thankless.

Notwithstanding the emendations he contributed at various times to periodicals, Theobald found time in 1728 for two other undertakings. One was an edition of Wycherly's posthumous works; the other was in the form of notes contributed to Cooke's translation of Hesiod. This last represents Theobald's first attempt at textual criticism in the classics. It also shows the regard his friends had for his scholarship not only in English but also in Latin and Greek. Even his enemies admitted his scholarship. Pope objected to him because he was a scholar. Scholarship and scientific investigation, from the time of the controversy between the ancients and moderns until after Pope's death, were looked upon almost as crimes by the wits. Cooke is very grateful to Theobald for his aid, and carefully distinguishes all the remarks of Theobald and other friends from his own. (In a note on *The Dunciad* Pope speaks of these notes as having been carefully owned by Theobald. The latter however had nothing to do with the owning: Cooke, like Theobald and unlike Pope, was scrupulous in giving credit for all assistance. This is an instance, among the many others, of Pope's backbiting and scurrility.)

¹⁾ L'histoire se répète. Think of the contention between Prof. Is. van Dijk and Mr. W. Kloos about the *Imitatio Christi*.

Early in 1729 Theobald began his correspondence with Warburton. The exchange of letters was very frequent up to the end of 1731, and continued with diminishing frequency until the spring of 1736, when it was broken off under circumstances hardly creditable to Warburton. In these letters Theobald and his friend exchanged their remarks and conjectures on Shakespeare and gave their opinions of them. In April of the same year *The Dunciad Variorum* made its appearance. To quote the whole title would take too much space, but never had an English work been issued into the world with all the elaborate paraphernalia common to the much satirized editions of the classics.¹⁾ Indeed, Pope seems to be intending a satiric thrust at them; the fact that he first planned the notes to be in Latin gives evidence of some such intent. But the real purpose of all this heterogeneous matter was to justify *The Dunciad* and continue the satire on its victims. Several misrepresentations of Theobald are given. Here are a few of them. In the single note giving his life there are no less than five. Pope speaks of Theobald praising his own productions in anonymous letters to *Mist's Journal*, for which statement there is no foundation. He makes Theobald the author of a communication to the same journal, June 8, 1728, which claimed there was no flaw in *Shakespeare Restored*; but the "wit" has nothing upon which to base his assertion. He repeats the accusation made at the end of his second edition of Shakespeare that Theobald concealed his design on the dramatist until after Pope's edition. He adds, however, that satisfaction had been promised to those who would assist him. To make matters worse, according to his account, Theobald at that time was soliciting favours from him. Lastly, he insinuates that Theobald had a part in the cry that Pope had joined with the bookseller to raise an extravagant subscription. Theobald had formerly answered the charge about concealing his design, yet Pope quotes this same letter as admitting the indictment. Later on Theobald completely demolished the accusation of ingratitude. As for the last charge, the only basis Pope had was the *Essay on the Art of Sinking in Reputation*, concerning the authorship of which he himself was not certain. Yet with all the elaborate commentary under which *The Dunciad* laboured the very book that was in a large way responsible for the poem was mentioned but once, viz. in the Note on l. 106, Bk. I: "What is still in memory is a piece now almost two years old; it had the title of *Shakespeare Restored*". In the poem proper references to the work are conspicuous by their absence. One passage only contains an allusion, commencing as follows:

There, thy good Scholiasts with unweary'd pains
Make Horace flat, and humble Maro's strains;
Here studious I unlucky moderns save,
Nor sleeps one error in its father's grave,
Old puns restore, lost blunders nicely seek,
And crucify poor Shakespeare once a week.

In the notes the allusions are more numerous but still infrequent.

Most of the satire in the poem hinges on Theobald's other works. The satirist is especially severe on pantomimes in general and Theobald's in particular, mentioning by name three or four of his most popular ones. Of his translations, the *Phaedo*, *Ajax*, and *Aeschylus* are honoured, though the second Theobald probably did not write, and the last he never published.

¹⁾ There is a curious Dutch booklet of about the same period, edited in the same way, entitled *De vermakelijke slatuintjes*.

His dramas are represented by *The Persian Princess*, *The Perfidious Brother*, and a line from *Double Falshood*. *The Care of Poverty* is the only one of his poems to find a place in the satire. Then there are accusations of dulness and stupidity, party writing and ingratitude, poverty, Theobald's method and verbal criticism. Mock emendations of Virgil are scattered through the notes and gathered together in the appendix under the title of *Virgil Restored*. These, written mainly by Arbuthnot, were taken from a production of the Scriblerus Club, which was originally directed against Bentley.

As regards the purpose of *The Dunciad* even that ardent admirer of Pope, Johnson, was sceptical, as he remarks: "That the design was moral, whatever the author might tell his readers or himself, I am not convinced. The first motive was the desire of revenging the contempt with which Theobald had treated his Shakespeare, and regaining the honour which he had lost by crushing his opponent". Revenge was the poet's motive, no matter what he might say about being moved by public spirit in killing off bad writers. Why such care in seeking out and publishing the titles of all productions written against him, except to justify him in hitting back? In "A letter to the Publisher" it is frankly stated that the satire is a reply to attacks, and the author himself says that he promised to remove from *The Dunciad* any who could give him assurance "of having never writ scurrilously against him". In Pope's mind a bad writer must have been one who wrote against him. The moral idea was an afterthought, for which his rising reputation for virtue secured wide belief.

It is this variorum edition of *The Dunciad* that was largely responsible for the character of Theobald that has come down to recent times. People were prone to accept the mass of incorrect quotations and statements found in the same volume with the satire, instead of going back to the original sources. In this way they spread broadcast Pope's unjust characterization of the critic, giving as historic fact what was half the invention of the poet's malice. In short, they accepted as truth Pope's own account of *The Dunciad* and the dunces. The effect produced by this procedure, together with the slanders propagated by Warburton and supported by Johnson, was to give such a permanent character to Pope's charges as to make them pass current even to-day.

Theobald replied in a letter to *The Daily Journal*, April 17, 1729, and worthily defended himself against all the unjust allegations. Nor did he stop there, but he carried on the war into his opponent's territory. Knowing wherein his strength lay, he again calmly pointed out errors in Pope's edition of Shakespeare, duly numbered and arranged in order.

Pope at first did not find many to take up his side of the quarrel. But in 1729 Savage came under his dominion and worked most assiduously as his tool and informer. The next year *The Grub-street Journal* took up the work upon the same lines. Pope was the moving spirit of the affair: his enemies are attacked, he and his friends are handsomely praised. The former are known as "Theobaldians", "Grubeans", "Knights of the Bathos", while the latter are termed "Popeans" and "Parnassians". Some others followed in the wake of these, but they are of less significance and interest.

By 1731 the feeling against textual criticism reached such a height as to cause one scholar to lift his voice in aid and defence. This was John Jortin, a man of high character and true scholarly instincts, and his remonstrations appeared in his *Miscellaneous Observations upon Authors Ancient and Modern*, 2 vols, 1731.

The greatest injury to the science, however, came from within the ranks of the critics themselves, from the greatest of them. Early in 1732 Bentley's

remarkable edition of *Milton* appeared. To justify the many violent changes which he advocated, Bentley devised a theory. This theory was that Milton dictated his poem to a friend who saw it through the press. The friend was ignorant, malicious, careless, and everything else imaginable; he introduced words, lines, and passages into the text. The corruptions were then increased by the carelessness of the printers. Yet Bentley had hopes of restoring the original text by his sagacity. Fortunately he left the text as it was, putting his emendations and discussions in the margin or at the bottom of the page. The edition was, as has been formerly observed, a failure. The only evidences of the classical scholar to be found in the work are seen in the vigorous logic of some of the notes. Of poetic appreciation there is no sign anywhere. Besides some feeble praise Bentley's *Milton* gave rise to a host of objections and indignant, scoffing, and angry comments. Theobald, who before its appearance had deprecated the great scholar undertaking a work wherein the ladies and children were prepared to laugh at him, emphatically resented Bentley's new departure. So ridiculous appeared the notes to him that he feared lest they were written to ridicule the critical art. Furthermore this edition strengthened the growing tendency to associate Theobald with Bentley. Though there was some pleasure in being joined with so great a man, the *Milton* could not but cast a bad light on the coming edition of Shakespeare.

In the beginning of 1733 there appeared a poem entitled *Of Verbal Criticism*. While the title would suggest a general satire on the science, the attacks are made almost entirely against Bentley and Theobald. In Bentley the author, David Mallet, sees the creator of the school of verbal critics, though he implies that in his edition of *Milton* the critic was imitating Theobald:

Yet he, prime pattern of the captious art,
Out-tibbalding poor Tibbald, tops his part.

On the whole the poem is a rather poor production, and there was nothing new in the attack.

In the midst of feeling engendered by attacks of this kind Theobald's edition appeared, *The Works of Shakespeare: in seven volumes. Collated with the Oldest Copies, and Corrected; with Notes explanatory and Critical*: By Mr. Theobald. London MDCCXXXIII. The edition did not appear until January, 1734, and it was successful in spite of all attacks, and this can point only to one conclusion, namely that in spite of sundry belated attacks and slanders by Pope and others the victory of Bentley and Theobald against the poets and wits had been won, so that at the end of the century Porson could claim for verbal criticism a high place in the activities of man.

Meanwhile Theobald had failed in his candidacy for the laureateship in December 1730, his purpose in seeking the position being to get a competence that would permit him to pursue his work on Shakespeare unhampered by financial cares. And although he enjoyed the favour of Walpole, and this nobleman remained his friend for some time after the appearance of his *Shakespeare*, he was never granted what he so much wished, — a pension.

Whilst preparing his edition of Shakespeare Theobald was also writing for the stage. From all these literary occupations it will be obvious that his legal profession was not very exacting; yet it required a certain amount of time. In the beginning of 1730 he was hard at work upon his *Orestes*. Though styled an opera, the production is really a drama, enlivened by a few songs and dances. Theobald confessed to Warburton that in the play he imitated Shakespeare, especially *Macbeth* and *Lear*; it might also be noted that some passages show the influence of Aeschylus. While not extraordinarily successful, the play was by no means a failure.

In spite of all his efforts, there is no doubt that at times Theobald keenly felt the pinch of poverty, and this period in particular marks the low ebb of his affairs. He more than once had the greatest difficulty to make both ends meet, and toward the end of 1731 he communicates his hardships to Warburton. Such was the condition of the man whom Pope was pursuing with a cold and relentless malice. As for the "one sincere and cordial friend", as Theobald had styled Warburton a short time before, who was at the time enjoying a comfortable living at Newark in Nottinghamshire, this same divine a few years later begrudged his friend the profits of his edition, and still later joined in the chorus of detraction and falsehood from which Theobald's reputation has so long suffered. Honest, confiding Theobald, to be thus ill-treated by an invidious poet and a jealous preacher of the Gospel!

But soon prospects began to look brighter, owing in some degree to the patronage of John Boyle, Earl of Orrery. The earl's father, who had nominally been Bentley's chief opponent in the famous Phalaris controversy, had been Theobald's patron in the past, and to him the scholar had dedicated several of his early productions. In March the earl placed his father's letters in Theobald's hands to be regulated. The late earl had been ambassador at Brussels during the latter part of Queen Anne's reign, so that the correspondence represented letters from many of the greatest men of that time. Especially was Theobald delighted with the correspondence of Bolingbroke, who did not confine himself to state affairs. The time required for this task detracted from Theobald's study but aided his finances. A month or two later he addressed *An Epistle* to Orrery devoted mainly to praise of the earl's father, which verses Theobald said his patron made golden for him. The epistle is to be found in Appendix C, p. 302 sqq.; it is the usual, conventional stuff. The dedication of all seven volumes of the edition of Shakespeare to the lord was the final form Theobald's gratitude took, and for this he was handsomely rewarded.

Theobald's edition of Shakespeare was slow in making its appearance. This was owing to several delays, the principal being that the publisher, Tonson, wished the remainder of Pope's edition being sold before he threw a new one upon the market. Also Theobald had several remonstrations with Warburton concerning the preface. When the latter had heard that an agreement had been reached with Tonson, he expressed anxiety as to the preface the editor might prefix to the production. There seems no reason to doubt that the egotistical clergyman had designs on that part of the work. From all that is known about the agreement between the editor and the publisher it may be safely inferred that Theobald profited to the extent of 1100 guineas by his edition. When to this sum there are added the 100 guineas he received from Lord Orrery for the dedication, and the twenty pounds from the Prince of Wales for his set, no one can complain that Theobald did not receive adequate compensation. At least he obtained more for his work than any editor of Shakespeare, with the barely possible exception of Johnson. (Pope had received £ 215 for his edition.)

As soon as Warburton saw the printed preface, he at once informed the editor that it contained passages which his friends knew to be his. It is not improbable that he was trying to force Theobald to make a public acknowledgment of his assistance, as indeed the editor might have done. If this was his intent, he was unsuccessful, for Theobald replied, with unnecessary modesty for himself and unwarrantable admiration for his friend, "Let those preacquainted Friends frankly know, I embraced them in a just preference to what I could myself produce on the subject." Then he adds, as if divining

Warburton's motive, "Nor would I have chose tacitly to usurp the Reputation of them, but as I formerly hinted, and you joined with me in sentiment, it would have looked too poor to have confessed Assistance towards so slight a Fabrick as my Preface".

Yet Warburton was not content to let his part in the performance go unrecorded. In his copy of Theobald's Shakespeare he marked all the passages which he considered his own. Upon this basis D. Nicol Smith in his *Eighteenth-century Essays on Shakespeare*, 1903, accuses Theobald of dulness and theft, the first because he called upon his friend for assistance, the second because he did not publicly acknowledge that assistance. But according to the author of the book under review it was only an habitual lack of self-confidence and a greatly exaggerated idea of his friend's ability that made Theobald quick to take advantage of the insinuated offer of help. As for "theft", if the accepting what is freely given, with the mutual understanding that no open acknowledgment can be made, comes under that head, he is guilty. And, adds Dr. Jones, from our point of view the editor should not have taken credit for what was not his, but some term other than the one given above must be used to express the fault. As for myself, I believe Theobald was too artless, too unsophisticated, and too unsuspecting to believe he was doing wrong in including observations of his friend in his edition. Theobald and Warburton had exchanged thoughts, remarks, and views upon Shakespeare, and I venture to say the gain and the instruction in this intercourse was greater on the side of the latter than of the former.

However this may be, after his break with his friend, it would appear that Theobald in his later editions omitted all the passages not his own. There is also sufficient reason for believing that Warburton claimed more than his share really had been. One instance, in another respect, of Warburton's mode of dealing with Theobald. Theobald had, *under Warburton's approval and encouragement*, inserted some Greek conjectures at the end of his preface. A little over a year after he broke with Theobald Warburton mentioned in a letter to the Rev. Thomas Birch "the foolish Greek conjectures" of the preface. Here all comment seems needless and superfluous. And then to know that actually the preface closes with an acknowledgment of assistance, in which Theobald is especially eulogistic of Warburton.

Theobald realized that it was incumbent upon an editor to be thorough in whatever he undertook. Not only was he the first to insist that the editor of an English classic had any duties at all; he was the first to analyze the work to be done. In his preface he divides an editor's province into three divisions: the emendations of corrupt passages; the explanation of obscure or difficult ones; and an inquiry into the beauties and defects of composition. This last, more strictly termed "literary criticism", he hinted, did not necessarily belong to an editor, and since it required no special qualifications of learning, was open to all who were willing. What Theobald was concerned with — what every editor is primarily pledged to — was to give the best text possible illuminated with all necessary explanations. By emendation he meant not only correcting by conjecture, but also the restoring, by collation, of a better variant reading. His notes prove him familiar with the works of Marlowe, Kyd, Jonson, Chapman, Heywood, Dekker, Marston, Webster, Ford, Beaumont and Fletcher, and Massinger, to say nothing of the number of anonymous plays he has occasion to mention. Particularly numerous are his references to the many plays of Jonson and Beaumont and Fletcher. Moreover, he was a diligent reader of a different species of literature. The antiquaries Stowe, Camden, and Dugdale he used to good advantage.

Besides the chronicles of Hall and Holinshed, he was familiar with such semi-historical works as Hakluyt's voyages. Lydgate and Caxton were known to him, though he seems to have been ignorant of Gower. With Chaucer and Spenser he was intimately acquainted, and, in a much less degree, with the sixteenth-century lyricists such as Wyatt, Surrey, Daniel, and Lodge. As Theobald widened his knowledge of the literature around Shakespeare his belief in the poet's learning was considerably shaken, and he became convinced that Shakespeare must have worked more from translations than from the original classic authors. The secret of his method was the insistence on proof for any conclusion. This is the method of the true scholar, one who loves "to go thorough-stitch" (an expression of Theobald himself) with whatever he takes in hand.

The similarity between the Boyle-Bentley and Pope-Theobald controversies was not merely superficial. Pope's edition of Shakespeare and Boyle's edition of Phalaris were both examples of careless scholarship and insufficient and inexact research. Furthermore Boyle's counter-attack on Bentley entitled *Examination of Dr. Bentley's Dissertation on the Epistles of Phalaris* (on which, properly speaking, several authors had been working), bears a close resemblance to *The Dunciad*, for though he attempts a serious defence, differing therein from Pope, it is plain to see that Boyle's main reliance is upon banter and satire, the last resort of careless study exposed to the relentless attacks of careful scholarship. Even the accusations remind one of Pope's satire — pedantry, insistence on trifles, out-of-the-way reading. Nor did satire suffice, for Boyle's malice went so far as to deal in misquotation and false statements, though hardly to the degree reached by Pope.

Theobald's edition and Bentley's second dissertation are, of course, works of different natures, but the spirit animating them and, in a general way, some of the methods employed are similar. They both represent the effort of true scholars, by reliance upon fact, proof, and authority, to silence forever the arguments of inaccurate investigation and malicious satire. The authors are vitally concerned, not so much in gaining the victory, as in ascertaining the truth.

The manner of producing evidence and the amount and widely diverse sources of proof are seen in the handling of detached questions. One example will suffice. Boyle and Pope had fallen foul of certain expressions their opponents had used: Boyle objected to Bentley's "first inventor", and Pope to a line of the *Double Falshood* satirized in *The Dunciad*. Never did the ridicule of two wits receive such a severe jar from the cold array of evidence presented against them. The classical scholar proceeded to give passages from Terence, Lucretius, Pindar, Herodotus, Plato, and a Greek inscription, while Theobald was not far behind with quotations from Plautus, Ovid, Seneca, Terence, Shakespeare, and Beaumont and Fletcher.

Theobald is *facile princeps* of all emenders of the text. Slight corrections eliminated, there remain some four hundred and twenty nine emendations for which he had to rely upon his genius and learning alone. Of these one hundred and fifty have been accepted, so that a little less than thirty-seven per cent of his corrections have stood the test of time and the scrutiny of scholars.

When consideration is paid to the large number of corrections attempted and the almost total obscurity of many of the corrupt passages, this percentage is amazing. Certainly no other corrector, either in English or the classics, can boast such a high ratio of accepted readings. Bentley falls far short of the mark. Warburton, who, according to Johnson, supplied Theobald with

the best part of his emendations, was successful in only thirteen per cent of those substitutions which Theobald saw fit to introduce into his edition. Undoubtedly the percentage would be much lower, had not the bishop's notes passed through his friend's sifting hands, so that only the more probable corrections were given to the public. These numbered one hundred and thirty-five, thirty-six of which the editor refused to insert in the text. Theobald's judgment in rejecting, if not in selecting, his assistant's notes is vindicated by the fact that only one of the thirty-six has been accepted. Still there are some critics who look upon Warburton as Theobald's guardian angel, saving him from himself.

Besides his emendations, Theobald often restored the text and defended variant readings where Pope had either emended the text or chosen the inferior reading. This he did in some two hundred places; in a score of places he rescued whole lines and even passages from the old editions. In a large number of places he restored stage directions, gave lines to their proper speakers, and in four plays introduced new act divisions, half of which have been accepted. His changes in punctuation are innumerable, ranging from the most trifling alteration to corrections that restore meaning to unintelligible lines. Explanatory notes clearing up obscure and difficult passages amount to well over two hundred, nearly forty of which Warburton supplied. These notes reveal, perhaps even more than his emendations, Theobald's wide reading and diligent research in the literature of his author's age. But not only in those particulars that most closely concern an editor was Theobald interested; unlike previous editors, he showed a curiosity in that threefold field of research that has since engaged the activities of so many scholars — the chronology, authorship, and sources of the plays ascribed to Shakespeare. As regards the authorship of some of the doubtful plays, Theobald stated opinions that curiously enough coincide with many of the conclusions of modern scholarship. The grounds for this statement and the examples given the reader should peruse for himself, as I perceive this article is expanding to an alarming bulk. Further on the author recalls a saying of Kenrick to the following effect: "Though Dr. Johnson hath made very few discoveries of his own, he hath discovered the method of making more of Theobald's at second hand, than ever the author could do when they were spick and span new".¹⁾ And later on the author says, speaking of Theobald's search for songs of Lodge: "Fortunately for Johnson, Theobald did not succeed in his search for Lodge's *Rosalinde*, while the later critic, following the path so clearly pointed out by the man he slandered, met with success".

As no human work is quite perfect, so Theobald's edition also has its faults. These defects Professor Lounsbury has clearly stated in his *Text of Shakespeare*, Chapter XXIV. Some were due to personal whim, such as the failure to number scenes. Others were occasioned by the eccentricities of the times in which he lived. These are chiefly the tendency to emend too much and the proneness to show erudition. Bentley, guilty of both, had set the fashion for his age. When compared with many of the scholars of his time, Theobald appears conservative in his conjectures and modest in his citations. His willingness to emend, however, caused him in some cases to miss the obvious meaning of passages, and in others to make good his lack of knowledge by conjecture. What might be called another blemish of his work was his treatment of Pope, who however got his deserts and had

¹⁾ A Review of Doctor Johnson's New Edition of Shakespeare by W. Kenrick, 1765.

nothing to complain of as he had reviled and provoked Theobald in an unprecedented way. Furthermore, Theobald's accusations of incompetency and carelessness were almost as universally true as Pope's were false.

The most reprehensible defect in the edition was the tacit adoption of many of Pope's metrical emendations. The poet had sought to improve Shakespeare's versification by reducing the lines to eighteenth-century regularity. In the majority of cases Theobald followed him, although knowing, and indeed stating, some of the peculiarities of Shakespeare's verse and pronunciation, as well as reproving Pope for his ignorance of these peculiarities and his attempt to make the verse smooth.

The faults of Theobald's edition seem trivial when compared with the difficulties he encountered. His study was hampered by the misfortunes and hardships with which his life was beset. The aids to research were few and scattered. As there were no large libraries where material could be found, he had to rely upon his friends and the booksellers for the accumulation of an *apparatus criticus*. Dictionaries and books of reference were both few and unreliable, while there was little previous research from which to obtain aid. Though he had the advantage of being the first to enter an almost unexplored field, yet he had not the advantage of approaching the text with that wealth of sympathetic intelligence that centuries of study have given to modern scholars. The great difficulty, however, lay in finding a method. As scholarly methods had not been employed on England's literature, he was forced to adapt to an English text the method employed by Bentley in the classics. This duty he performed so effectively that he blazed the trail succeeding editors have always followed.

Thus far I have pursued the account of Dr. Jones' book to the end of the fifth chapter, which is the most interesting part. Two chapters are following entitled respectively "Theobald's Later Life" and "The Progress of the Method".

All in all, the years immediately following his edition were the brightest of his career, and this period also marks a renewal of his interest in the classics. He supplied notes to Cooke's *Hesiod*, and contributed three papers of classical observations to Jortin's *Miscellaneous Observations*. Furthermore he was working on editions of Aeschylus and Hesychius, which, however, never appeared. Dr. Jones cherishes the belief that, had his work on these classics been put before the public, the editor of Shakespeare would have occupied a creditable position among the classical scholars of the eighteenth century. This opinion is borne out by the fact that Middleton enlisted in Theobald's services, and it testifies to the high regard in which his scholarship was held by contemporaries.

In the midst of his ambitious projects there came what must have been a grievous disappointment and a real injury. Revealing at last his true nature Warburton broke off the friendship under circumstances by no means creditable to the divine. Theobald's failure to publish all of his assistant's notes was the chief irritant to Warburton's pride, and also it seems the latter expected some financial remuneration for his aid. But as Dr. Jones remarks, for the avaricious critic, who was fully cognizant of Theobald's financial straits, to begrudge his friend the profits of his edition while he himself was enjoying a comfortable living, was certainly not becoming a Christian, much less a clergyman. Theobald had made a most handsome acknowledgment of Warburton's services in his preface, while in the body of the work each note belonging to the other was acknowledged with high praise.

Furthermore, he was eager to repay his debt in kind. When he first heard

of the other critic's intention of editing *Paterculus*, he rejoiced in the undertaking and assured him that when Shakespeare was off his hands, he would repay the least parts of his debt by perusing the Latin author to find corruptions, a task he would embrace with great satisfaction. In his subsequent correspondence he frequently mentioned Warburton's design, at the same time sending him such notes and transcripts as he thought might be helpful.

Warburton's part in the disagreement was nothing short of contemptible. Two or three years later he was to be on intimate terms with the man who had abused his friend. Not only that, he himself was to slander that friend who had always dealt honourably by him, a friend who, though suffering grievous injuries at his hands and placed in a position to make things very unpleasant for Pope and his newly acquired champion, maintained a high-minded silence.

From this time on there is little to be found on Theobald's life. His reputation as a scholar did not decline; in 1740 appeared the second edition of his *Shakespeare* in eight volumes, from which those notes and parts of the preface which he owed to his former assistant were excluded. He also omitted the conclusion of the preface, in which he had acknowledged the assistance he had received, and had mentioned the works read in the preparation of the edition.

Probably the pressure of finances incited him to attempt his last critical work. In 1742 he entered into an agreement with the Tonsons to edit the plays of Beaumont and Fletcher, upon which he had been working for fifteen years. In this undertaking he was aided by Thomas Seward and a Mr. Simpson, but neither of them was able to render very valuable assistance. Trouble having arisen as soon as the first volume had been printed owing to Theobald's unwillingness to admit notes that did not meet with his approval, the edition did not appear until 1750, six years after Theobald's death. He had edited the entire first volume, the second to p. 233, and the third to p. 69. There were ten volumes in all, and it soon appeared Messrs. Seward and Simpson were poor editors compared to Theobald.

Of Theobald's last days nothing is known except that they were embittered by a severe disease. After suffering from a jaundice for several months, he met a peaceful death on Sept. 18, 1744. Two days later he was buried in St. Pancras cemetery, attended by one friend.

Well might people have said "here cracks a noble heart", as there is little to blame and much to praise in Theobald's life. Continually battling against adversity, the disheartening demands of poverty, and the cruel attacks of Pope, he bravely struggled through the task he had set himself. Sensitive, modest, lacking in self-confidence, his nature was all the more open to the thrusts of satire and the falsehoods of malice. Though for the most part suffering in silence and passing over with manly dignity the libels and abuse of his adversary, at times he showed a seeming vindictiveness, which, after all, was but the natural reaction of an oversensitive and underconfident nature to almost unendurable taunts. Even then he took no mean advantage, he indulged in no falsehood; he attacked only what was manifestly reprehensible. He made by far the best figure in the *Dunciad* war. In the midst of all the dirt and filth thrown up by both sides, he alone was free from stooping. Sympathetic, liberal, true to his friends, it is not strange that they so anxiously defended him. Only one proved recreant. Possibly it would be hard to find in history a man who has suffered more injustice at the hands of posterity.

Theobald's *Shakespeare Restored* and his edition of the dramatist mark a beginning of an epoch in English scholarship just as plainly as the *Epistle to Mill* and the *Dissertation on the Epistles of Phalaris* mark a new era in classical research. The importance of Theobald's work lies in the fact that it inspired scholars with an interest in their native literature, created a demand for critical editions of English poets, and made popular a method which, with amplifications and modifications, has come down to the present day.

Too much emphasis cannot be placed upon the service Theobald did for research in English literature when he turned the attention of scholars to a new field of investigation, a field that had either been unnoticed or scorned before. As long as editing remained in the hands of poets who were not scholars, there was no hope for any critical work. It was Pope's fame and not the worth of his edition that increased the interest already felt in Shakespeare. The merits of the work attracted no scholar, created no interest in the text. Its defects aroused Theobald, but Pope can be given no more praise for that result than can be granted Boyle for Bentley's *Dissertation*. Had not the scholar reviewed the poet's edition, textual criticism in the great dramatist could hardly have been awakened. The attention of scholars was turned not only to the Shakespearean text but also to the text of other English poets. There gradually arose a demand for critical editions, and the incentive of praise, so powerful before in producing editions of the classics, prompted scholars to undertake English poets.

While the impulse to edit Shakespeare came from Theobald directly or indirectly, the editors immediately following him did not show much familiarity with his method. Hanmer followed Pope, but used some of Theobald's material. Warburton contented himself with his former friend's collation, and stole from him to add to his own frequently absurd notes. And Johnson, intent on his common sense remarks, did not advance collation or investigation very far. With the later editors of Shakespeare, however, the case is different: "So far as any later editor achieved success," says Prof. Lounsbury, "it was by following and improving upon the methods which Theobald had adopted."¹) A few examples, of eighteenth century criticism, will suffice, the more as Theobald had a posthumous hand in one of them. The first critical edition of Ben Jonson appeared in 1756, twelve years after Theobald's death. The editor, Peter Whalley, makes several remarks on how to handle the text, which read so much like those given by Theobald that it is difficult not to suppose that his preface was largely modelled upon the preface to Shakespeare. He himself bears witness to the fact that his methods were Theobald's. He had obtained the latter's copy of Jonson with marginal notes, and the very notes bear out this statement. Many allusions are explained by references to the literature and customs of Jonson's time, while the meanings of many words are illustrated by quotations from Jonson and his contemporaries. Unlike Theobald, Whalley seldom supports his emendations, which are sometimes introduced without notice, but they are few and unimportant. Yet his own words, together with the fact that he frequently makes use of material furnished by Theobald's *Shakespeare*, show whom he was imitating.

The critic who approaches Theobald more closely than any other is Thomas Warton, author of *Observations on the Faerie Queene of Spenser*,

¹) The late Professor Lounsbury is the author of *The Text of Shakespeare*, in which work he gives Theobald fully his due. By minutely investigating *The Dunciad* and its surroundings, he has given a true and comprehensive account of its hero, laying to rest, once and for all, the evil spirit loosed by Pope.

1754. This is evident throughout the whole work, especially by the wide reading Warton had indulged in. No wonder he fell foul of Pope's line "All such reading as was never read," and he remarks upon it: "If Shakespeare is worth reading, he is worth explaining; and the researches used for so valuable and elegant a purpose, merit the thanks of genius and candour, not the satire of prejudice and ignorance."

Although Theobald's name was in high repute amongst several of the best scholars and editors of his time, later on it gradually waned. One reason why in the end his reputation was unable to overcome the misrepresentations of Pope lay in the fact that as his method became more general, its source was obscured. The generation who knew Theobald and his works realized his importance and patterned their own procedure after his. Their work became in turn new centres of influence, so that by the last quarter of the century the later tribe of critics considered the method anybody's. Not only was he deprived of the honour of formulating and practising a method by which results could be obtained, but his own results were continually pillaged by critics, to whom have been attributed discoveries made many years before. Theobald the editor disappeared; Theobald the dunce survived.

But Dr. Jones has rendered scholarship and Theobald the signal service of unduncing him and reinstating him in his hard won rights of a scholar and an editor. Since Theobald's days hundreds have profited by his example and followed the path he pointed out. Dr. Jones and his predecessors deserve the thanks of all who know how to value justice and truth. His book makes excellent reading, and he has treated his subject in a captivating manner.

I have tried to give an account of the contents of "Theobald Restored", as we might call this book, "to the selfsame tune and words" of its author, adding but little *de meo*, and it is devoutly to be wished that this attempt may be an incentive to lovers of English literature and Shakespeare to read the whole work for themselves. It is of the most vital importance for sound scholarship and thoroughness.¹⁾

EDWARD B. KOSTER.

¹⁾ In case of a reprint Dr. Jones will do well to pay renewed attention to the proof-reading, there are several mistakes in the Greek and Latin quotations. In the English text proper there are very few misprints; on p. 232 we read Egnlish, and on p. 239 we notice a curious fault in a quotation — it may be the fault lies with the author quoted — : Johnson, where apparently Jonson is meant.

War Words and Peace Pipings.

(Materials for a Study in Slang and Neologism.)

II.

anti-aircraft, employed against hostile air-craft (of guns, troops, etc.); plural *anti-aircrafts* (*Punch*, Sépt. 1915, p. 261.)

anti-flash gear, see quotation :

The guns are cleared away and we all don our anti-flash gear, which consists of a mask and a pair of gloves made of non-inflammable material and designed to protect us from cordite fires; our appearance when rigged up is somewhat reminiscent of the pictures of monks at a mediæval *auto-da-fé*. (*Daily Mail*, 16 July, 1918).

anti-submarine, employed in fighting enemy submarines.

anti-tank, used against enemy tanks; as *anti-tank gun*, *anti-tank rifle*.

anti-tempus, a vulgar corruption of *anti-tetanus* [serum], for which Tommy Atkins is responsible:

A burly private, with the flesh of his thigh showing clear white where the grimy khaki had been cut clear and hung flapping, limped in and pushed forward a neatly bandaged limb for inspection. "A doctor did that up in the trenches", he remarked. "Said to tell you 'e did it an' it was all right, an' I only needed the anti-tempus an' a ticket for 'ome. (Boyd Cable, *Between the Lines*; p. 224.)

anti-Waster, supporter of the anti-Waste campaign inaugurated by the *Daily Mail* in 1920:

We are apparently on the threshold of a period when the devout anti-waster will make Municipal dancing a plank in his platform. (*Rev. of Rev.*, 1921, p. 355a.)

anti-Zeppelin bullet &c. explain themselves; the makers of the anti-gas devices, especially anti-gas respirators, mentioned in the following quotation were called *anti-gas workers*:

In a long list of inventors' triumphs are the paravane, which saved us £ 40,000,000 worth of war ships from mines; the Pomeroy anti-Zeppelin bullet; the Stokes gun; secret telephones; improved hand bombs; and the devices that beat the U-boats. Women helped too, and among the products of their inventive brains are several anti-gas devices, such as preventive sprayers and so on. (*Daily Mail*, 13 March, 1918).

Antrim, a soldier from Antrim in Ireland:

At 8 A. M. the Hun countered heavily and hove the Antrims out. (*Punch*, July 1917, p. 21b).

Anzac, soldier of the Australia, New Zealand Army Corps. According to a note in *The Graphic*, 27 April, 1916, it was Sir W. R. Birdwood, who invented the word "Anzac" as a telegraphic code address. Cp. the following quotations, which all of them shed some light on the history of this now so famous word:

THE ANZACS IN LONDON.

"One of the features of the day is the presence of so many Australian and New Zealand soldiers in the streets of London, chiefly convalescents from the Dardanelles," says the London correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*.

"They are conspicuous in sun helmets and a lightish brown hospital uniform, which distinguishes them from the invalided soldiers from these islands in their light blue.

"The 'Anzacs,' as they are popularly called, are both delightful and delighted." (*Public Opinion*, 24 Sept., 1915).

MY DEAR TATLER, — Language — good language I mean, not exuberance of verbosity such as the Censor will not pass — is a very interesting and important thing to be dealt with discreetly and with due respect for decency, and I think it is a terrible thing that in this critical era of "simplifid speling" we should run the risk of having the special brand of "Northclyfese" grafted on to the common or garden bastardies of journalese as it is writ. Therefore I feel profoundly grateful to those two officers of the Royal Flying Corps on active service in France who took their lives in their hands, risking behind anonymity the flail of the Northcliffe press, which has so painfully flattened out "Simple Simon, the very Pi-man," late of the Home Office, and did most mightily protest against the word "airplane" instead of aeroplane, as we less cultured have always called it. So be, but perhaps in this case it was to prevent public men, ostensibly educated people, and after-dinner speakers pronouncing it "air-e-o-plane," diddled and dumbfounded by the diæresis, now dropped and buried in classic memory. Still, that was no excuse for "airman" instead of "aviator"; and then, again, we find Sir John Simon's breakfast-table egg-curdlers trying to impose "Anzac" upon posterity for Australian and New Zealander combined, regardless of the fact that, grand fighting-men both, they have neither part nor lot in common. Surely it is time to call a halt. (*The Tatler*, 19 Jan., 1916).

MILITARISM.

Everybody talks in terms of war nowadays. When a schoolboy friend of mine wants to say that anything is "hot stuff" he calls it "simply Anzac." In a back street the other day I heard a woman shout at her husband: "Don't you sergeant-major me!" (*Sunday Pictorial*, 6 Febr., 1916).

It seems awful to be always asking, asking, asking; but it isn't for ourselves, you know, it's for the Tommies. They are nearly all Terriers or 'Zacs here, and a jolly fine crowd, too. The 'Zacs might be just a *leetle* less conceited, but they're *splendid* scrappers. If you saw the way they hop out for an attack you wouldn't want to be Mr. Turk. (*The Tatler*, 2 Febr., 1916).

We also find the word used as an adjective, as appears from the *Daily Mail*, 15 April, 1919:

ANZAC BRIDES.

By A WOMAN JOURNALIST.

MELBOURNE.

Many hundreds of young English — or British — girls who have married Australian soldiers have already been welcomed to our shores, and according to cabled reports there are still somewhere about 10,000 to arrive.

It has been my duty to meet most of the boats in which these girls have travelled, in order to discover what the "Anzac Brides," as they are called here, have to say about their journey and their impressions. As there are so many more to make that journey it might be well to point out a few ways whereby they can travel in much greater comfort than their predecessors appear to have done.

Cp. also *Anzac Day*:

But April 25 — imperishable as Anzac Day — has come and gone. (*Nat. Rev.*, 1919, p. 305).

As a place-name the word Anzac has enjoyed but a brief existence:

In spite of the disappointment of being so near our first goal, the men do not seem at all downhearted, and express themselves as willing to have another try. If our plans did not succeed in full, it is certainly no fault of the troops, who advanced from Anzac. It only needed just a little of the dead-weight of numbers to be removed for the Anzac Corps to have made good and consolidated that short and desperate grip it got on Chunuk Bair. (*Daily Tel.*, 3 Sept. 1915).

apron, see *balloon apron*.

aquaplane, another name for *hydroplane*; the word is also used as a verb in *The Tatler*, 1916, p. 77, where we find: "A charming little maid aquaplaning on the Pacific Coast", as the heading of a few lines of letterpress.

Archibald, *Archie*, anti-aircraft gun; *the Archies*, the anti-aircraft force. According to Cassell's *E. D.*, this nickname is derived from the popular song: "Archibald, certainly not", with allusion to the fewness of the hits made. But cp. what an officer in Flanders wrote (*Punch*, Sept. 1915, p. 261b):

You can always spend a pleasant hour watching the anti-aircrafts — for some unknown reason called "Archibalds" — missing the planes not once, but twenty times a minute.

A few more quotations may be subjoined; in one of them the new word is used as a verb:

The German staked his anti-aircraft measures upon a type of gun which was promptly nicknamed "Archibald" by the British soldiers. It was a quick-firer, mounted upon a special type of pedestal so as to secure an extra elevation, and was capable of throwing shrapnel to heights variously estimated as ranging from 4,000ft. to 6,000ft. (*Daily Mail*, 29 March, 1916).

Thursday morning about 8 o'clock I heard the aeroplane sentry blow his four whistles (I was just contemplating a bath) and put my head outside to see where the Hun was. The "Archies" (anti-aircraft guns) were at him, and getting some in pretty close to him as he came over the battery. I could hear one of our machines up, and looking round saw him after the Hun. "Archie" evidently didn't see him as they went on firing at the Hun until one round nearly hit our machine. Then they stopped. (*Times*, 9 Oct., 1915).

If you are heard flying about without lights you will soon have dozens of search-lights on you. You won't be 'Archied' — that would be dangerous to other machines and to people on the ground. (*Daily Mail*, 22 Jan., 1919).

the **Fourth Arm**, the Flying Corps.

Armageddon, supreme conflict of the nations, esp. the conflict of the great War. (See *Rev.*, XVI, 16).

armament school, school where airmen are trained:

So Jack Bull, though he knows all about the theory of flying, must take a course at the Armament School before they will let him into the air. He must study the manners and customs of the Lewis gun and the Vickers, and how to treat them when they are not feeling well. He must learn what sort of a gun platform an aeroplane is, and what sort of a target the German aeroplane will make. (*Daily Tel.*, 27 Sept., 1918).

Armistice Day, 1 the 18th of November, the day on which the armistice was signed; 2 the anniversary of that day.

armleteer, see quotation from the *Sunday Pictorial*, 28 Nov., 1915:

THE NEW ARMY OF ARMLETEERS.
New Badge of Honour Worn by Derby's Men.
SCENES IN LONDON.
M.P.s' Protests Against Conscription.

The khaki armlets are out.

The Army Clothing Factory at Pimlico, busy for weeks with their manufacture, has now completed its work, and yesterday, from a central depot in Cockspur-street, thousands of the armlets were being distributed to the various recruiting centres in the metropolitan area.

The news that the armlets were out soon became known, and gave a noticeable fillip to recruiting.

Eligible men, anxious to receive at once the badge which would tell the world that they, at any rate, were doing, or had tried to do, their bit, presented themselves at the London recruiting offices in considerable numbers.

"On Monday, when the full meaning of the issue of the armlets will have impressed itself upon the public mind," said a recruiting officer to the *Sunday Pictorial* yesterday, "we shall be doing big business."

armour piercer, an armour piercing bullet or shell:

It was a bad day for the battery. No. 4 gun got into trouble first; a six-inch "armour piercer" landed four yards in front and to the left, and simply buried it. The side and roof of the emplacement just "sogged in" and put it out of action. No one was hurt, though it was thought that the layer must surely be smothered before he was dragged out, but he was not. (*Daily Mail*, 20 Oct., 1916).

army compounder, see quotation:

Women who have trained and are thoroughly reliable are offered 30s. a week without food or allowances to do the work of 'Army compounders' who receive 6s. a day and allowances. Rather than accept the Army's 30s. a week qualified women have done the work voluntarily for nothing." (*Daily Mail*, 15 Jan., 1916).

army godson, see quotation from the *Daily Mail*, 25 July, 1921:

MME. CAPUS'S "ARMY GODSON."

FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.

PARIS, Sunday.

A young man named Rombauid, who is said to come of an excellent family, shot and killed himself last night while visiting Mme. Capus, the wife of the celebrated writer and member of the French Academy.

Rombauid, during the war, was one of the many "army godsons" adopted by the wife of the writer, and since the armistice he had remained an occasional visitor to her house. He appeared to be very highly strung and suffered from an idea that he was being persecuted.

artillery duel, mutual bombardment with shells.

ash-can, slang-word for the envelope containing a depth-charge:

"DEPTH-CHARGED!"

From the captain of a U-boat, a limp, bedraggled figure that had been fished out of the sea with a boathook, came to me the following description of what it is like to be depth-charged.

"Well, how did you like it?" he was asked ironically. By "it" the questioner meant the series of exploding "ash-cans" which had thrown skyward big lumps of the sea mixed with fragments of submarine. (*Daily Mail*, 23 Sept., 1918).

asphyxiating gas, an invention of the Germans in the Great War, as also the terrible *asphyxiating shells*.

assembly, the second beating of the drum or sounding of the bugle before a march (E. S. Farrow, *Dict. of Mil. Terms*). According to the N. E. D., the first beating is called the *general*, and the third, the *march*.

assembly trench, a trench where troops assemble; see quotation from *Punch*, 8 Aug., 1917, p. 104:

At 10.30 the firing will stop and you will make your way to the assembly trenches, where bombs will be served out. At 10.35 the entire force will advance in open order. No prisoners will be taken.

atcha, soldier's slang for: all right (Thomas O' Toole, *The Way they have in the Army*, p. 38).

Atkinese, the special and very racy idiom of Thomas Atkins, the British Soldier.

Aunt Voss, the German *Vossische Zeitung*, (*Tante Voss*), see *Daily Mail*, 22 Dec., 1915:

"Aunt Voss's" representative was much impressed with the *Kultur* of the "fine-feeling, heroic, and highly educated men" of the U-boat crews, "who have had heaped upon them with such shameful injustice insults of every kind in both enemy and neutral quarters."

auntie, soldier's christening of the 12-inch gun; see *grandmother*.

Aussie, Aussy, familiar abbreviation for Australian Soldier, still in use:

Sticklers for etiquette, as we all know, have been shocked at times by what has appeared to be a laxity of discipline among the Australian soldiers. But the discipline is there, rigid and unswerving, as I have seen, when it is called for — and I must confess I thought the sight of an officer in a full motor-car finding room on his knee for an ordinary "Aussy" a very pleasant example of comradeship. (*Daily News*, Sept., 1918.)

The win of the Australian Army team by a goal and a try to a goal at Newport faithfully represented the superiority of the "Aussies". It was a fine, vigorous, and well-played game, but presented as a spectacle to a South Wales crowd it scarcely came up to popular expectations. (*Daily Mail*, 17 March, 1919.)

Austroboche, Austrian of German origin:

There are certainly two main ideas in the book — the one that the war has been forced upon Germany; the other that Kultur, as monopolized by the Teutonic race — the Boches, the Austroboches, and the Surboches (or Prussians) — is the excuse for world-conquest. (*The Athenæum*, March 1916, p. 119c.)

aviate, a back-formation from *aviation*, meaning: manage or travel in aircraft.

aviette, engineless man-worked aeroplane.

avion, a heavier-than-air flying machine, a war aeroplane (Webster, *Dict.*).

awkward squad, according to H. Wyndham, *Following the Drum*, a body of men who are inattentive, but the usual meaning is: the body of recruits not yet competent to take place in regimental line.

F. P. H. PRICK VAN WELY.

Notes and News.

English Association in Holland. Between February 3rd and 11th Mr. H. Hamilton Fyfe, sometime special correspondent of *The Times*, lectured before the eight branches on *The Danger to Civilisation: an English point of view*. He dealt with the economic and other consequences of the war in Central Europe, and illustrated his account of contemporary history with a series of characteristic slides. If the European situation is fairly well-known to the average man in Holland, it was the point of view which commended the speaker to his Dutch hearers. Incidentally the lecture carried a special English atmosphere of its own, being really designed for an English audience; and the appeal throughout was to English rather than to specifically continental sentiment.

From March 27 to April 4 Mr. G. K. Chesterton will be lecturing on *Dickens* and *Browning*. The Haarlem branch is also receiving Mr. P. S. Allen, of the University of Oxford, who will give a lecture on *Erasmus*.

From April 3rd—12th Mr. Daniel Jones, with three members of his staff, will give a course of English phonetics, adapted to the needs of Dutch students, in connection with the Volks-Universiteit at Rotterdam.

From July 31—August 18 the University of Oxford will hold a Vacation Course for Foreign Students. The general subject of the lectures will be *Contemporary England: its Political, Social and Economic Life, and its Language and Literature*. The staff includes many well-known names, Prof. H. C. Wyld among them. Particulars may be obtained from Rev. F. E. Hutchinson, University Extension Delegacy, Oxford, or (by members of the Association) from the Association Secretary, 5 Leidscheweg, Utrecht.

The University of London School of Librarianship has arranged a Summer Vacation School, to be held at University College, London, from July 17th to July 29th. It should appeal, not only to Dutch librarians, but also to students of English language and literature, for whom special provision is made in the programme. Among those who will take part is Dr. E. A. Baker, Director of the School, who will give 10 lectures dealing with recent English writers. There will be visits and excursions to the great libraries and to Windsor and other spots of historic importance.

For further particulars apply to Dr. W. Seton, Secretary, University College, London, W. C. 1., or to the Association Secretary.

Special attention is drawn to the list of recommended boarding houses and addresses of English families taking paying guests, available for members of the Association on application to the Hon. Secretary. Special requirements should be stated, and a stamped addressed envelope enclosed with each enquiry.

Translation.

1. The office of the firm of Vermeet & Co. in Warmoesstraat was an apartment with a low ceiling on the first floor. 2. There used to be two rooms, but the wide folding-doors had been removed, so that it had become

one long room with three windows in front facing the street, and one large square one with nine window-panes at the back, overlooking the yard. 3. In the backroom was the entrance for the public.

4. Underneath this office was another office and overhead were the store-rooms of the firms, who dealt in all sorts of export-goods.

5. Vermeet & Co. was one of the principal houses in this line. 6. It was an old-established, respectable firm.

7. It was one of those old-fashioned houses, they said on the Exchange, such a house with unlimited credit, but otherwise no ostentation. 8. No money was spent on luxuries for the office, but never yet had a draft been refused acceptance, if the drawer was respectable and the amount correct. 9. The heads of the firm had never had a private office, their writing-tables stood less than a yard's distance from those of the clerks, and a visitor could hardly find room for a seat, but in the private houses of the Vermeets there had always been many spacious, luxuriously furnished rooms. 10. And the present Vermeet, who was childless and had therefore taken his nephew Bandt into partnership, now occupied a splendid villa at Hilversum.

11. Everything was old in the old office. 12. The desks, which year after year stood against the walls, were of an indiscriminate greyish-yellow colour, stained here and there with inkblots. 13. On the faded well-worn linoleum floor-cloth there were inkstains too, as also on the wood of the office-stools and on the legs of the desks. 14. Gaslamps with dusty shades stood next to rows of ink-pots, ink-bottles of every size and trays with penholders and pencils. 15. Waste paper baskets stood in the shade under the desks and in the centre of the frontroom was a round table littered with sample boxes and other business odds and ends.

16. The ceiling had once been white, the bookkeeper asserted, the only one who could speak with authority on the subject. 17. And the wallpaper visible here and there was oppressively crowded with ornamental flowers of a faded green colour and patched in two or three places with newer pieces that did not match it.

18. At the windows in front stood opposite each other the two writing-tables of the heads of the firm, with their leather arm-chairs in front of them and their wastepaper baskets beside them, all old, long-used and worn out.

19. That morning Mr. Bandt was late. 20. It was nine o'clock and he had not yet made his appearance, to the great surprise of the bookkeeper, who often looked at his watch and held it to his ear, doubting whether it were not fast. 21. The other clerks were talking and laughing, twisting round on their stools, but the bookkeeper, a staid man, was annoyed at their giggling, and now and then cast a peevish glance at the correspondence clerk, who surely was a married man too, and should therefore not make himself so cheap with those callow youths.

Observations. 1. *The firm Vermeet.* A genitive equivalent is required after the word *firm*. *The Vermeet firm* is right. — *The Warmoesstraat.* The definite article is generally omitted before the names of streets. — *A low room:* The rooms of the cottage were *low*. (E. Peacock, *N. Brendon*, II, 67.). — *On the groundfloor.* The groundfloor is level with the street [*rez-de-chaussée*] and consequently not a *verdieping*. We say: *in the second stor(e)y* (— a space!) = *on the first floor*. Compare sentence 4, from which it is obvious that *groundfloor* is not suitable.

2. *Formerly it had been two rooms.* — *Broad porte-brisée.* The difference

between *broad* and *wide* is not easy to define. We may say a *broad* or a *wide* street (river). Apertures in general are *wide*, not *broad*. A mouth is *wide*, but not *broad*. A wide opening. What is *broad* is mostly *wide*, but not vice versa (Crabb). The Century Dictionary says that *broad* is generally the larger and more emphatic: a wide river is not thought of as so far across as a broad river. 't Is not so deep as a well, nor so *wide* as a church-door; but 't is enough (Shakespeare: *Romeo & Juliet*, III, 1.). *Porte-brisée* is French, and not given either by the Oxford or the Century Dictionary. See Dr. Fijn van Draat's *Outlanders* i. v. — *So that* is always written in two words. Compare the spelling *cannot*.

3. *In the backroom the public entrance was*. Inversion is necessary because the adjunct opens the sentence and the verb is so vague in meaning as to approach the nature of a copula. *The people's entrance*. Quite wrong, implying as it does the existence of a separate entrance for those less abundantly blessed with worldly goods. Cf. The People's Books, The People's Palace.

4. *Below - Under - Beneath (Underneath)*. *Below*, lower than the plane of, *under* lower in the perpendicular line of; *beneath*, close under as: the sun sinks *below* the horizon; a thing is *under* a chair or tree, *beneath* a heap of rubbish. *Under* has often the sense of *beneath* as "under whose wings". (Century Dictionary i. v. *Below*). The words *below* a photograph (we should expect *under* here) (*Strand Magazine*, Vol. XVII, 430). *Underneath* it is the following inscription (*Temple Readers*, V, 151). You put the unfortunate young man to sleep in that little lonely attic room of the house with nothing *below* him but the disused stable (*Strand Magazine*, Nov. 1901, 57). The family *underneath* (De benedenwonenden; Sir Conan Doyle, *Slater Case*). To marry *below* one's rank (Mrs. Gaskell, *Cranford*). To marry *beneath* one's station (*Pearson's Magazine*, Aug. 1903, 204). It seems *beneath* your dignity to be savage (Hewlett, *Little Iliad*). The bandbox is *underneath* the pink slip (R. L. Stevenson, *New Arabian Nights*). — *Magazine* has the sense of "periodical" or of "powdermagazine". — *The firm, who* (, *which*). Both right, but *who* seems preferable when the heads of the firm are thought of: This firm, *who* have given a large order...., *which* when the institution itself is referred to: This firm, *which* was established a century ago. — *Goods for export*.

5. *Branch*. May mean filiaal. Therefore *branch of business* had better be rendered by *line*: Mr. Augustus Cooper was in the oil and colour *line*. (Dickens, *Sketches*). *Most principal* is a case of redundancy.

6. *A firm of good standing*. *Solid firm* is correct. I mean a *solid*, well-established concern that offers a reasonably good career to its employees (E. M. Forster, *Howards End*, p. 135). A widow of a *standing* which can only be expressed by the word *genteel* (Hardy, *Return of the Native*, I, 51). Of the municipal appointments in the market few go to any but solicitors of "standing". (Harmsworth, *Self Educator*, p. 6751.)

7. *On 'Change; On the Exchange*. The full form requires the definite article. — *No refinement* is hardly suitable. — *Show - Display - Ostentation*: *Show* is the general term, *ostentation* is always bad, the others may be good in certain relations. Sir Ulick loved *show* and company (Edgeworth, *Ormond*). A house kept to the end of *display* is impossible to all but a few women (Quoted N. E. D. i. v.) He had a negro's love of *display* and was continually buying new clothes (*Strand Magazine*). — The great naval display of this week (*Graphic*, July 31, 1909). Firework display.

8. *Luxuriant things* is an impossibility (exuberant in growth): St. Leonard's forest *luxuriant* with beech and birch (Dowden, *Shelley*). Figuratively: a

luxuriant style. — There should be inversion of subject and verb in a sentence opening with a negation: *Never yet had a draft been refused (acceptance)*. See Kruisinga's *Accidence & Syntax*, § 815, 3; (Third Edition, § 2068). *Dishonoured* is right. A bill (of exchange) is said to be dishonoured when the drawee (betrokkene) refuses to accept it on its being presented for acceptance, or having accepted, refuses to pay it when it falls due (= at maturity).

9. *Owners of the business*. — *Had never had a closet*. A closet is a small room; the word is obsolete and now known only in the compound *water-closet* and in that sense. — *Metre* — *Meter*. The two spellings should be kept apart, *metre* denoting a lineal measure, *meter*[-mætər] occurring in compounds, barometer, gasometer [barometer, gashouder]. Note also *gas-meter* [gæs-mi : tər], *kilometer* [kiloumi : tər]. — *Dwellinghouse*. A comfortable dwelling-house and several outhouses (Selous, *S. E. Africa*, 251). — *Costly furnished*. Adjectives in *-ly* do not generally form adverbs. However: Gerald was laughing *jollily* (*Windsor Magazine*, 1912, 57). *Preciously-furnished*. In the sense "in a costly manner, at great cost or expense" Murray marks the word obsolete.

10. *The present head of the firm; the now head of the firm*. Mr. Dudgeon's father had the responsibility of collecting the landowner's rents just as *the present* Mr. Dudgeon had at the time of which I speak (Mrs. Gaskell, *The Squire's Story*). — *Had introduced his nephew as a partner; Had admitted his nephew as a partner*. — *Now lived in (occupied) a splendid villa*. — In *Hilversum*. Before small towns and villages, and foreign cities far remote, *at* is used. This rule is not absolute: The chief street in Scheveningen (*Graphic*, March 27, 1909). See Kruisinga, *Grammar and Idiom*, § 238.

11. Inversion would make the sentence rhetorical: Great is Diana of the Ephesians. Other refuge have I none.

12. *Year in, year out, Year by year*. She must practise *year in, year out*. (*London Magazine*, Oct. 1910, 131). *Year by year* she became poorer and poorer (*Books for the Bairns*, no. 4). Prayed and fasted *year after year*. (*Harmsworth Magazine*, March 1910, 112). *Stained here and there with old inkstains* sounds rather awkward.

13. *Linoleum carpet* is an impossible combination.

14. *Globe* is a spherical glass shade for a lamp: *gasglobe*. The electric globes pulsed with white light. (*Strand Magazine*, Dec. 1906, 702). *Veil* has a different meaning. — *Basins with penholders*. Basins are circular and used chiefly to hold water or other liquids. *Of all sizes*. Houses of all sizes (F. Swinnerton, *Shops and Houses*). Girls of all nationalities (*Cosmopolis*, 1898, 310). Firearms of all descriptions (*Harmsworth, Self Educator*, p. 1835).

15. *In the middle of the room* is right. We could see in the middle of the room a man seated on a rug (Crawford, *Mr. Isaacs*). In the centre of the library was a table (Irving, *Sketchbook*). *In the midst* is often used figuratively: *In the midst of life* we are in death. *In the midst of this doubtful occupation* (*Strand Magazine*, July, 1914). However: A great giant lived in a castle *in the midst of a forest* (*Books for the Bairns*, no. 3). — *Sample-cases* = *monsterkisten*. — *Business-lumber*. Lumber is a collective name for *useless odds and ends*.

16. *Assert—Maintain*. *Assert* seems to expect doubt or contradiction of what one says and is for that reason the proper word here. We *maintain* what we are called upon to defend. Asserting commonly precedes maintaining. And yet I *maintain* him a varlet, A scoundrel who dares to deny That the poppy's immaculate scarlet Can vie with thy hair (Nonsense rhyme). —

To pretend is to make believe. — *The only one who could know this* (Not: know it). After know, try, tell, ask Dutch *het* is not translated.

17. *Here and there visible*. The adjunct of place had better come last. *Oppressive full*. An adjective is qualified not by another adjective but by an advrb. — *Mended* is hardly correct (= repaired). A broken article is *repaired*, old trousers and the like are *patched* i. e. a patch of similar material is put on them.

18. *Leather(n) armchair*. The form *leather* is perhaps preferred in matter-of-fact language. (Poutsma, II, 6).

19. *Mr. B. was behind his time*: An hour behind his time Hogg arrived at 2 o'clock. (Dowden, Shelley.)

20. *He had not yet arrived (turned up)*. To turn up means to present oneself casually [opduiken]. *Much to his astonishment*. — *Consulted his watch*. — *Held it at his ear* should be *H. it to his ear*. Compare *put o's back to the door*, *o's shoulder to the wheel*. — *Doubting if it was not late*. The use of *was* instead of *were* in the subjunctive is not uncommon, even in literary style, except in clauses introduced by *if*, or *as if* where it imparts a vulgar tinge to the language (Poutsma, *Mood and Tense*, p. 5). But compare Kruisinga, *Accidence & Syntax*, ³ § 199).

21. *Chairs* = *Stoelen*. A stool is a chair without a back. Cf. *music-stool* = *tabouret*, *pianokruk*. A clerk from my old office swaggered in and did not remove his hat. I descended from my *stool*, and put on my own hat. (Mark Rutherford, *Mr. Whittaker's Retirement*.) — *Correspondent* is rather a misleading word. Its meaning in English is one with whom intercourse is carried on by letters, specifically one who sends from a distance regular communications in epistolary form to a newspaper. I am not much of a correspondent = ik hou niet erg van brieven schrijven. *Correspondent to the New York "Demagogue"*. Answers to Correspondents [Correspondentierubriek.] Henning is your *correspondence clerk* (Morrison, *Red Triangle*, 124.) — *Should not be so familiar with frolicsome youths*. *Rogue* [schelm] is quite out of the question. *Mischievous boys* could not be said of adults.

Good translations were received from Miss B. M. C., Tilburg; Miss M. G., Amsterdam; Miss A. H., Flushing; Miss R. C. O., Arnhem; Mr. J. P., Rotterdam; Mr. Th. A. P., Breda; Miss H. W. S., Rotterdam; Mr. B. de W., Moordrecht; Miss A. B. V. v. Z., Hasselt.

Translations of the following text should be sent to P. J. H. O. Schut, 60 Maarlant, Brielle, before May 1st. They will be returned with corrections if accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope.

Zijn ros in beweging stellende, reed de Prins, onder een blij hoorngeschal, de brug over, gevolgd door den geheelen stoet. Men zwenkte dadelijk het Bosch uit en kwam eerlang aan de weilanden, die bejaagd zouden worden. Het was een fraaie zoele morgen, gelijk men soms, zelfs hier te lande, in Februari aantreft: een van de winterdagen, waarop ons reeds een balsemende voorjaarslucht te gemoet stroomt, die ons bijna zou doen gelooven, dat wij spoedig de lente zullen zien wederkeeren, wisten wij niet, dat wij eerst 108 Maart met zijn gure stormbui en April met zijn regenvlagen moeten doorworstelen. En daarbij, nog niet een der voorboden van het warme seizoen liet zich op de uitgestrekte weide zien: geen ooievaar was nog het hem bekende plekje komen terugvinden: geen kieviten vertoonden zich nog, die sierlijke kringen vormden, waarbij haar wieken, zoo vaak zij door de zon bestraald worden, als lichtvonken flikkeren: slechts hier en daar stoven koppels spreeuwen van voor de voeten der paarden weg, of scheen een oude kraai op den top van een boerenhek gezeten, de komst van den stoet af te wachten en tilde dan eerst, als met moeite, de zware vleugels op, om zich op een afstand weer neer te zetten.

Dan, hoe gunstig ook de weersgesteldheid ware, minder voordeelg was die van het jachtveld: daar de grond over 't algemeen vrij drassig was en zich hier en daar groote plassen bevonden, die men nog kon rondrijden zoolang men stappende voortging, doch welke het te voorzien was, dat moeilijk zouden kunnen vermeden worden wanneer men eens het wild achtervolgde. Het moge ons, die nu leven, dan ook vreemd schijnen, dat men tot jagen een dag uitkoos in een zoodanig ongeschikt seizoen, 't welk heden bovendien tot het verboden tijdperk behoort. Maar, ofschoon men in de zeventiende eeuw geen tijd van opening en sluiting der jacht kende, zoo was deze desniettemin ook toen ongeoorloofd wanneer er sneeuw of ijs op het veld lag; terwijl de jachtordonnantien in Holland streng verboden, het geheele jaar door meer dan twee malen in de week ter jacht te gaan, en tevens, op éénen dag meer dan twee hazen en één of twee koppels konijnen te vangen. Het natuurlijk gevolg dezer bepaling was, dat de liefhebbers geene gelegenheid, die maar niet bepaald ongunstig was, verzuimden.

De belemmeringen, welke men nu en dan ondervond, zoo door de plassen van welke ik heb gesproken, als door de slooten, die het weiveld doorsneden, hadden dan ook ten gevolge gehad, dat het grootste deel der jagers, en daaronder de dames, niet over de weilanden voortreden, maar een binnenweg hielden, van welken men de vlakke kon overzien. Wat den Prins betrof, die als een echte jager voor geen hinderpalen terugdeinsde, hij bleef aan 't hoofd der overigen recht toe recht aan het jachtveld houden.

Reviews.

La Pensée de Milton.

To the Editor of *English Studies*.

Dear Sir,

As Prof. Saurat and his reviewer agree to have their difference over Milton's philosophy settled by me, I should be very much obliged to you if you would kindly publish this letter in your journal.

First some points which Prof. Saurat asks me to state, *viz.*

1) that Prof. Hanford has proved that Milton had the *Syncellus* in his private library, which, in Prof. Saurat's opinion, supports his case;

2) that Mr. Pompen has misunderstood the statement on p. 102 as to Milton's Latin, a statement which only refers to the opinion of professional Latin scholars but does not question Prof. Saurat's knowledge of Latin;

3) that the length of the quotations and translations in the treatise is a feature conditioned by the general structure of a D. litt. thesis in French.

On the other hand Mr. Pompen wishes to point out

1) that he repeals his charge of dishonesty;

2) that he considers the severity of tone towards the end of his article not fully justified;

3) that he maintains the substance of his article;

4) but that, at the same time, he can to some extent share my appreciation of Saurat's work as an attempt to arrange Milton's opinions into a system.

To this I should like to add a few words of my own.

I consider Mr. Pompen's criticism as being acute and to the point in many respects. He is right to question the originality of Milton as a philosopher. Indeed, before Mr. Pompen wrote his review, Prof. Saurat's later discoveries made him alter his own previous opinion as to this fact. In his *Milton et le Zohar* Prof. Saurat states: "l'originalité de Milton comme penseur sort bien diminuée de cette confrontation" (pp. 17—18). This actually proves Mr. Pompen to be right on the above point, and that he was right in cautioning against too limited an outlook when Milton's Pantheism was to be traced.²⁾ (As a fact, Mr. Pompen also correctly scents Cabbalism as a possible source!)

Those who are inclined to regard Prof. Saurat's treatise as the last word on a comprehensive, "*thoroughly consistent*" philosophical system, (which

Prof. Saurat evidently does not do himself, witness his later papers!) will do well to keep in mind Mr. Pompen's judicious words that "Milton was an extremely subjective man of strong moods and passions; and such men often pursue incompatible lines of thought". Moreover, we are actually indebted to several later papers by Prof. Saurat for additional information on the subject in question, and this information, as we saw, sometimes corrects Prof. Saurat's own earlier opinion.

But, on the other hand, I most decidedly refuse to think lightly of Prof. Saurat's work. It is true that he relies on Masson as to biographical matter. But to one who has for many years made Milton his chief study, it is obvious that Prof. Saurat's psychological skill in spite of this fact works simply admirably and covers the case quite differently from what Masson's reasonings or some late psychopathic extravagancies do. I should like to refer the reader to e. g. p.p. 61—62, where, in my opinion, the author with unflinching perspicacity lays bare Milton's very soul as convincingly as it is admirably executed. And though, now and then, I differ in opinion from Prof. Saurat, or else I am at least inclined to leave some question open as admitting of a different solution, I must regard his work as the most valuable till now published on Milton's philosophy, indeed as the only clever one as yet existent on that subject.

I am, Dear Sir,

Yours very truly

S. B. LILJEGREN.

¹⁾ Mr. Pompen's review of D. Saurat's *La Pensée de Milton* in our number of Dec. 1921 called forth a remonstrance from the latter, which, together with our reviewer's reply, was to have been inserted in our February issue. At the request of Prof. S. B. Liljegren, of Lund, Sweden, and with the consent of both writers, this correspondence was not published, and a letter from Prof. Liljegren is now inserted instead. — Ed.

²⁾ As to Mr. Pompen's reference to Bruno I feel doubtful, because I have long been engaged in a study on the relations of Milton and G. B. but am unable to trace any influence.

Vanessa, and her Correspondence with Jonathan Swift. With an Introduction by A. MARTIN FREEMAN. 1921. London: Selwyn & Blount Ltd.

Ever since Lord Orrery's indiscretion the tragical history of Swift's loves has been a favourite topic with many a literary and unliterary talker, and numerous are the solutions of the mystery, which, in spite of all, still envelops them. I have in my little collection of books bearing on the "Vanessa-Frage" even a novel in 2 volumes, by a Miss Woods, a rather ambitious but wholly vapid concoction, representing Swift as a kind of facial contortionist, who regards ladies with a look half-serious, half-mocking, and wholly bitter. And with this phenomenon Ester Vanhomrigh fell passionately in love! But the story is really too pathetic to write flippantly about it, and it is the last editor's chief merit, that in his lengthy introduction he gives us the events with as little guesswork as possible, and throughout assumes the attitude of a generous and respectful, unbiassed, historian.

How easy and how tempting to a certain kind of critical mind was the attributing of an indecent meaning to the frequently repeated "drinking of coffee" in Swift's letters. Fortunately nothing of the kind is attempted by Mr. Freeman, who gives us Esther's and Swift's letters — for the first time edited from the originals — with just as few comments as are needful for

the understanding of them, and acceptable in a manly and gentlemanly treatment of the facts.

A table of letters on page 49 of the Introduction shows the number of letters, with their dates, exchanged between Swift and Miss Vanhomrigh during the period from 1712—1722. It is obvious that a good many of the letters have been lost. Mr. Freeman even thinks that "it would be rash to assume that we now have more than half the original number which were exchanged".

How this fragmentary state can be accounted for, is a question that is not easily answered. Vanessa used to endorse her letters — a fact overlooked by all previous possessors of the MS. — and there are indications that she made drafts of more letters than are here forthcoming. The volume as it is now in the MSS. room in the British Museum, was bought at Sotheby's sale on May 6th, 1919.

In an 18th century hand it bears the following inscription:

"Original Letters of Dr. Jonathan Swift Dean of St. Patrick's, Dublin, to Mrs. Van Homrigh celebrated by him in his published Works under the name of Vanessa.

With the foul copies of her Letters and Answers, in her own handwriting." Besides Vanessa's and Swift's letters, two of which had not been published until now, Mr. Freeman's book contains ten miscellaneous letters, which are from Additional MS. 38671 acquired by the British Museum in 1913. Nine of these have been unpublished hitherto, and with the exception of Robert Percival they are addressed to unknown correspondents of Swift's.

A specimen of Vanessa's spelling — which is not faultless in spite of her teacher — a facsimile of her handwriting and a very full index make Mr. Freeman's book into a very attractive volume, which should be in the hands of all serious students of Swift.

W. v. MAANEN.

The Case for Byron.

Byron. Par PAUL DE REUL, Professeur à l'Université de Bruxelles. Extrait de la 'Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles', nos. 8—9, Mai—Juin 1921.

The case for and against Byron as a man and a poet is stated in this essay with a precision and insight that bespeak the intelligent critic. It is one of the commonplaces of modern literature that Byron, thrust out by England, was acclaimed by the Continent of Europe, and this seems to have led many European men of letters to see in him a prophet. Typical of this pro-Byronic school of criticism is the Dane Georg Brandes, who in his *Hauptströmungen der Litteratur des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*¹⁾ hails him as the English romantic poet, and as the great champion of Liberalism. M. de Reul, dealing with Byron's naive pride and affectations, very aptly disposes of this kind of hero-worship with the remark: "Qu'on cesse de le traiter en prophète et l'on trouvera du charme en sa fatuité."

Some English writers fall into the other, far less sympathetic, extreme of denying him any degree whatever of genuine feeling and sincerity, to say nothing of merit as a poet. Morley, in his *First Sketch*, p. 910, contemptuously writes: "At fifteen he *considered*²⁾ himself to be in love with his neighbour at Annesley Hall, Miss Chaworth" — and, on p. 928: "Also in July, 1816, he *compared*³⁾ his luckless marriage with another that might

¹⁾ The title is, of course, that of the German translation.

²⁾ My italics. — Z.

have been" To put down such statements after reading *The Dream* is sheer malice, or total lack of psychological insight.

Prof. de Reul is no unqualified admirer of Byron's poetry. His criticism of that part of the works in which he voices romantic melancholy and revolt, in the person of the melodramatic hero that is always himself, is mostly destructive. We can agree with his assertion that it is "caduque" and "démodée". *The Corsair* he compares to an operatic libretto, *Lara* reminds him of a *roman-feuilleton*. However, without going all the length of Mr. Hopman's essay in the first volume of this journal, who sees in their typical hero a mystic symbol, and ultimately our inmost Self, I think something might, in common fairness, have been said in favour of the romances. M. de Reul holds up for our compassion Taine's enthusiastic passage on the death of Lara; why not at least give a word of praise to the grim description of the battlefield, which for passionate realism leaves the companion piece in Scott's *Marmion* far behind?

In his discussion of *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* the writer remarks that "Harold adopte une attitude qui sied à sa physionomie, mais qu'il ne créa point et qu'il ne justifia qu'imparfaitement", and points out its resemblance, in some respects, to Chateaubriand's *René*. It is well-known that the conception of the Byronic hero is to be found already in Mrs. Radcliffe's *Mysteries of Udolpho*, and M. de Reul illustrates the fact by a quotation from this work. He then follows up the progress of the type through *Corsair* and *Lara* to the third canto of *Harold* and further in *Manfred*. An opportunity to bring out the *Childe's* character by contrast, and at the same time to show one of Byron's limitations as a poet — the task which M. de Reul expressly sets himself in this article — has been neglected in touching on Harold's sojourn in Greece. Nothing could be less classical, i. e. less Hellenic, than his reflections on Greece as set down in the second Canto. In the opening stanzas we have the sceptic in a monk's cowl, skull in hand, moralizing on Athens. In st. X, when it comes to picture the grandeur of Greek architecture — "it may not be". He thunders at Elgin, but lacks words to describe the relics of art about him. Byron's view of Greece is not the artist's, but that of the public school boy —

The scenes our earliest dreams have dwelt upon.

Historic associations take the place of artistic impressions. He is the modern man with his being out of harmony visiting Greece and seeing it under the aspects of decay and destruction; the enthusiast for nature, admiring its landscape; lastly, the revolutionary calling the Greeks to revolt.

"Un poète subjectif s'exprimant dans une langue oratoire", Prof. de Reul defines Byron. At the same time: "Il voulut être grand homme plutôt que grand écrivain". As a personality with a powerful influence on the 19th-century mind, the writer does him full justice. He believes, and demonstrates "que la critique littéraire à elle seule ne rend pas justice à une personnalité qui dépasse la littérature et déborde son cadre". "La renommée de Byron est un chapitre de l'histoire des mœurs au XIX siècle".¹⁾

R. W. ZANDVOORT.

¹⁾ It always seems a somewhat flat conclusion to end a review with an enumeration of printer's errors, but perhaps a note will be less offensive. I regret to say that there is every evidence of negligent proof reading, which is all the more annoying in an excellent essay like the present. I have noted, besides many mistakes of minor importance, an incorrect reference (p. 10), and wonder whenever Pope wrote "la Bouche volée!"

New Plays by John Galsworthy. ¹⁾

The six plays contained in this crudely bound and printed volume are all either short or very short sketchy pieces.

The First and The Last awakens reminiscences of old-fashioned melodramas with its very romantic love-affair followed by a murder and the suicide of both lovers. The exposition starts with a rather singular series of questions and answers. Keith Darrant K C., sitting asleep in his room, is awakened by the entrance of his brother Larry, who looks very haggard and ruffled. Keith, startled at his uncouth appearance, asks: 'What is it? ... Are you ill? What is it, man?' And receiving no answer, he immediately makes a bolder and somewhat surprising shot: 'Have you committed a murder that you stand there like a fish?' to which Larry answers (in a whisper): 'Yes, Keith.' And however incredible it may at first seem to Keith — and to the audience — his facetious supposition proves in this exceptional case but too true. Fortunately the following parts rise highly above this weak melodramatic beginning. The play contains some very effective scenes and leads up to a strong dramatic finish.

The second play: *The Little Man, A Farcical Morality*, short though it be, is really too long for its meagre contents. The international conversation on the platform and in the train, bringing out once again in a very superficial way the old generally accepted differences in the character and manners of the average American, Englishman and German, is but very moderately humorous; the story, turning on an unlikely mistake, too evidently made for the moral purpose.

In *Hall-marked* the humour is of a more refined character. It is a really amusing, gently satirical piece, but not a bit more than the subtitle indicates: a 'trifle'. —

The two plays that follow: *Defeat* and *The Sun*, dealing with situations closely connected with the great war, seem to me the best of the volume. It is only regrettable, that the interesting central ideas, underlying these two tiny plays, have not inspired the author to a fuller treatment, a more sustained effort.

In the last piece of the volume *Punch and Go*, though but 'a little comedy' of barely twenty small pages, we see no fewer than ten personages besides a play within the play and within that again a cinema-like dream-scene; a plethora leaving an impression of more or less discordant unrest. The novelty and picturesqueness of the scenic effect form some compensation for the insignificance of the main action and the hackneyed theme of the play within.

When compared with last year's volume, ²⁾ which brought the almost perfectly beautiful play: *A Bit o' Love* and the powerful, well constructed and interesting *Skin Game*, this new collection must be judged a decided disappointment. But then a comparison with its forerunner can hardly be justified, as the present volume does not contain a single play of a length sufficient for deep character-analysis or skilful plot-construction.

May it soon be followed again by a few plays of a more ambitious scope.

Oct. 1921.

A. G. v. KRANENDONK.

¹⁾ *Six Short Plays* by JOHN GALSWORTHY. London, Duckworth & Co., 1921.

²⁾ See Review *E. S.* II, 89.

Mood and Tense of the English Verb. By H. POUTSMA. Noordhoff. 1922. 91 pp. and 138 pp. f 5.90, cloth f 6.50.

A Handbook of Present-Day English. Volume II. English Accidence and Syntax. By E. KRUISINGA. Third Edition. Kemink & Zoon. 1922. XXXI + 912 pp., cloth f 19.50.

The simultaneous appearance of these two books is apt to suggest the consideration of the question whether the almost complete restriction of English language-studies in Holland to the modern period is really justifiable from a scientific point of view. The only justification seems to me that the more thorough a scholar's knowledge is of the living stage of English, the only one indeed that can be known thoroughly at all, the better he is prepared to study language in general, or earlier periods of English. It is especially in the study of the syntax of earlier periods of English that we may hope for this one-sidedness to produce results, similar to those in Stoffel's *Studies in English*.

Another question that some students will ask is, if it is not to be regretted that two large books should be written on the same subject at the same time. It is true that Mr. Poutsma's book now runs into some thousands of pages, whereas the second contains "only" 900. But this difference of size is hardly sufficient to show that there is room for two books of this kind.

There is a more important difference, however. Mr. Poutsma's purpose is to supply an answer to any question of grammar a student may wish to ask when he is writing English. Can this verb be construed with a gerund or must it have an infinitive? Must we use an accusative with infinitive here, or a subordinate clause? Is the imperative possible or must we use a different construction? Such are the questions to which Mr. Poutsma gives an answer, supplying full lists and indexes. The second book, on the other hand, though it may sometimes answer practical questions such as these, will often be found "incomplete" by the practical student. For it does not aim at being a book of reference, a storehouse of grammatical fact, but it tries to answer questions of a different kind; it aims at giving the information wanted by those who wish to know *why* some things are wrong in grammar, and why others are right. In short Mr. Poutsma's book treats of the *how*, the second of the *why*. The merits of Mr. Poutsma's book are well-known, and have been acknowledged in reviewing an earlier instalment of his work in this periodical. As to the second book mentioned above, I must naturally leave it to the judgment of others.

E. KRUISINGA.

The Year's Work in English Studies, 1919—1920. Edited for the English Association by SIR SIDNEY LEE. Oxford University Press. 1921. Price to Members 3/6.

The English Association is steadily increasing its range of activities. The present publication will be welcome to all students of English who used to rely on the *Jahresberichte der germanischen philologie* published by the Berlin association of students of modern languages,¹⁾ which are no doubt excellent and of German thoroughness, but do not satisfy those interested in the modern period and especially students of living literature. In respect

¹⁾ Published by Reisland, Leipzig.

of time, however, they are far superior to the bibliographies published by *Anglia*, which could often supplement the *Jahresberichte* just because they appeared so much later. For Oldenglish we have the admirably complete lists of books and articles in Brandl's *Geschichte der englischen literatur* (1908), in Paul's *Grundriss der germanischen philologie*; it also mentions the bibliographical means of reference; for Middle English the well-known *Geschichte der englischen literatur*, by Gustav Körting, 1899, has been overtaken by the *Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050—1400*, published in 1916 (Oxford University Press) to which a supplement has already appeared, bringing it down to Sept. 1918.

With the help of these publications, and the series now opened by the English Association, the student will generally have no difficulty in finding out what work has been already done on any subject. The review of the work for Nov. 1919 to Nov. 1920 is descriptive rather than critical, and has been divided into eleven sections entrusted to eleven contributors, five of whom are women. It is not possible for a reviewer to test the whole book with regard to its completeness, but my impression is that non-English work is not exhaustively dealt with. It is to be hoped that this is due to the peculiar circumstances of the time. In the section on *Philology* Luick's *Historische grammatik* is not mentioned. There is no reason to suppose that this is owing to any set purpose, for Miss Hilde Murray generously acknowledges the work done by foreign scholars; perhaps the new instalments of Luick's work did not reach England in time to be mentioned in this volume. Any one who compares the lists in *English Studies* for 1920 will find more lacunae. On the other hand, there are several books and articles that might fail to become known to specialists but for this manual. We hope, therefore, that this venture of the Association will have as much success as its predecessors, so that further volumes will be possible.

K.

Brief Mentions.

Englische Phonetik mit Lesestücken. Von Dr. A. C. DUNSTAN.
Zweite verbesserte auflage besorgt von PROF. DR. MAX KALUZA.
Berlin und Leipzig. Vereinigung wissenschaftlicher Verleger. 1921.
4.20 M.

This new edition, essentially the same as the first, has been made more systematic and thorough, without a considerable alteration of its size and consequently of its character. Some undoubted mistakes have been corrected; impossibilities such as *peasoup fog* with three even stresses have disappeared. Some sections, such as those on American English and on Spelling Reform, have wisely been omitted, or replaced by a short note. Other sections are completely new. The phonetic transcriptions have been largely left unchanged, but the reviser has made some corrections. The absence of any preface makes it impossible to say on whose authority the changes have been made. But those I have noticed seem to me to be perfectly justified. Thus for Dunstan's hænt ju we now find hævnt ju; for roil 'royal' we read roiæl, although in this case the sounds intended may be the same, and loil 'loyal' has been left unchanged (p. 76). I had taken ðru:/aut 'throughout' for a misprint, but find it also in the new edition (p. 83). One correction may be suggested: in section 62 it should be made clear that the rule for the length of the vowel (in *cab*, etc.) refers to final syllables. The little book in its new form may be strongly recommended as a thoroughly reliable introduction to the subject. — K.

Nederlandsch—Engelsch Handelswoordenboek, by A. BONS JR. and C. VAN DER SPEK. 232 pp. Deventer, Æ. Kluwer, 1921. f 3.75.

It is pleasant to be able unreservedly to recommend this dictionary. It is quite up to date and in the matter of completeness compares very favourably with De Froe's *Engelsch Handelswoordenboek*. A list of abbreviations, geographical names, and English weights and measures ends the volume. Though this is not the place to enter into a lengthy discussion of its pros and cons the following remarks might prove useful: *Aftakken*: branch off. *Afteekenen* sign for a telegram (a postal parcel). We will look at your pay sheet and mark it o.k. *Baal*: state the difference between *bag* and *bale*! *Bagagedrager*: parcel carrier. *Betaalsrol*: paysheet. *Beursch*: sleepy (of pears). *Carbonpapier* is not the same as *doorslagpapier* (= duplicating paper). *City bag* is also *brief bag*. *Deurdranger*: doorcheck. *Gloeikopmotor*: hot bulb motor. *Haussebeweging*. Add: bull-movement. *Houtbestrating*: Wood pavement. There is a misprint on p. 88: to reach its highest point. *Informatiebureau*. Add. Information Bureau. In London there are many Information Bureaus of the Y. M. C. A. *Ingevoerd*, goed — zijn = to have a good connection. Could not be said of articles! *Inschrijven*. Add: baggage laten — = to have luggage registered. *Jaarbeurs*. Add: Industries fair. The fourth Dutch Industries Fair will be held in Utrecht from February 23, until March 6 next. (Times Weekly Edition 30, 1, '20.) *Kabelwagen* = traveller. There is no entry for *kogelfleschje*. *Monster*. Op — verkoopen. Add: to sell by sample. In Argentina the wheat is sold by sample (Pitman Reader p. 259). *Paardentram* = horsetram. *Proefnummer*. Add: experimental copy. *Ronddraaideur*: Revolving door. *Spijkertrekker* (also called "kistopener"): nail puller. *Uitspannen* (een verzekerde) = ? State difference between *insure* and *ensure*. (*Verzekeren*.) *Voteeren* (krediet): to vote a credit. *Wanbaal*: slack bag. *Zwaaideur*: swingdoor.

A fairly good dictionary and one which ought to be in every office. — S.

Readings from Ruskin by SUSAN CUNNINGTON. London, George Harrap & Co., 1921.

The extracts, preceded by a short Memoir, have been taken from 'Modern Painters' 'Ethics of the Dust', 'Queen of the Air', 'Unto this Last', 'The Cestus of Aglaia' and 'The Seven Lamps of Architecture'. The choice seems to me on the whole a very felicitous one. There are about twenty extracts in all, each accompanied by some apposite quotations from the great poets and a few very suggestive questions and exercises. In these latter the plastic arts are in evidence; repeatedly the pupil is called upon to describe pictures or to make a drawing himself, in connection with what he has read. A very commendable practice, especially for readings like these. Is not the relationship between art and literature too often lost sight of in our schools?

An excellent little book for the highest classes or the school library, well calculated to foster an appreciation of the beauty of nature and of human ideals and a taste for good literature. — A. G. v. K.

Bibliography.

POETRY, FICTION, DRAMA.

The Complete Works of Sir Philip Sidney. Edited by ALBERT FEUILLERAT. In three volumes. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ × 5 $\frac{1}{4}$. Vol. II., x. + 395 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1922. 12s. 6d. n.

This middle volume of M. Feuillerat's edition of the complete works of Sir Philip Sidney (1554-1586) contains the last part of the *Arcadia*, "Astrophel and Stella," and a collection of all the other poems known to exist in print or manuscript and the masque of *The Lady of May*. [T.]¹⁾

Selections from the poems of Sir Walter Scott. Edited by A. HAMILTON THOMPSON. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ × 5 $\frac{1}{4}$, xl. + 196 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1922. 4s. 6d. n.

This volume concludes the series of "Selections from English Romantic Poets" It is preceded by a substantial critical introduction and a table of the principal dates in Scott's life. [T.]

The Complete Works of Edgar Allan Poe. Edited by J. H. WHITTY. 7 × 4 $\frac{1}{4}$, lxxxvi. + 190 pp. Constable. 1922. 7s. 6d.

This edition of Poe, with memoir (sixty-eight pages) and twenty-one new poems of which the editor claims to have established Poe's authorship, appears now for the first time as a "Riverside Pocket Edition," and for the first time also in this country, after publication in the United States. [T.]

¹⁾ Descriptive notices marked [T.] are inserted by the courteous permission of the Editor of *The Times Literary Supplement*.

The Uncollected Poetry and Prose of Walt Whitman. Collected and edited by EMERY HOLLOWAY. In two volumes. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$. Vol. I, xcii. + 264 pp. Vol. II, ix. + 351 pp. Heinemann. 30 s. n.

The Chapbook. No. 25. Febr. 1922. Twelve New Poems by Contemporary Poets. Poetry Bookshop, 1/6 net.

Poems: Second Series. By J. C. SQUIRE. Hodder and Stoughton. 6s. net.

Smoke and Steel. By CARL SANDBURG. Cape, 1922. 7/6 net.

The Personal History of David Copperfield. By CHARLES DICKENS, with critical appreciations old and new. Edited by G. K. CHESTERTON, HOLBROOK JACKSON, and R. BRIMLEY JOHNSON. (The Readers' Classics Series.) $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, 823 pp. Bath: Cedric Chivers. 1922. 8s. 6d. n.

The series inaugurated by this volume is to be an extensive one. Sixty-nine volumes of reprinted masterpieces are already named as forthcoming. The plan is simple. There are no notes and, in the ordinary sense, no editorial introduction. The idea is to present the full text, and to collect as introductory matter critical appreciations of it written by well-known authors and critics of various ages and countries. First come "Appreciations" specially provided for the series by living writers; these are followed by "Comments" on the book extracted from many sources. In the present case the Appreciations (which vary in length from one to six pages) number seven, and are supplied by Mr. William Archer, Mr. Ford Madox Hueffer, Mrs. Meynell, M. Jules Claretie, M. Emile Legouis, Mr. Theodore de Wyzewa, and Mr. Holbrook Jackson. The "Comments" (which on the whole run rather shorter) are culled from twenty-four authors, including Matthew Arnold, Taine, Andrew Lang, Anatole France, Swinburne, Lady Ritchie, Brunetiere, &c. The print of the book is agreeable enough, though a trifle small; the binding deserves high praise and enables the pages to lie comfortably at rest wherever you open them. [T.]

Tales by Nathaniel Hawthorne. Selected and edited with an Introduction by CARL VAN DOREN. $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, xxii. + 438 pp. Milford 5s. n.

Containing thirty stories now for the first time arranged in chronological order with their dates from "Twice Told Tales," "Mosses from an Old Manse," and "The Snow Image, and Other Twice Told Tales." Introduction, pp. 22. [T.]

The Awkward Age. By HENRY JAMES. $7 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$, xxvii. + 483 pp. Macmillan. 1922. 7s. 6d. n.

The Life and Death of Harriett Frean. By MAY SINCLAIR. 8×6 , 184 pp. Collins. 1922. 7s. 6d. n.

Measure for Measure. (The New Shakespeare Series.) $7\frac{1}{4} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$, xlv. + 176 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1922. 7s. n. [A review will appear.]

Shakespeare Adaptations: The Tempest, The Mock Tempest, and King Lear. With an introduction and notes by MONTAGUE SUMMERS. $8\frac{1}{4} \times 6$, cviii. + 282 pp. Jonathan Cape. 1922. 15s. n.

Everyman in his Humor. By BEN JONSON. Edited with introduction, notes, and glossary. By HENRY HOLLAND CARTER. (Yale Studies in English.) $9 \times 5\frac{3}{4}$, cv. + 452 pp. New Haven: Yale University Press: London: Milford. 1922. 17s. n.

Esther. A Tragedy. Adapted and partially translated from the French of Jean Racine By JOHN MASEFIELD. $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$, 68 pp. Heinemann. 1922. 2s. 6d. n.

HISTORY OF LITERATURE, CRITICISM.

Seneca and Elizabethan Tragedy. By F. L. LUCAS. $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$, 136 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1922. 7s. 6d. n.

The Shakespeare Canon. By J. M. ROBERTSON. I, The Origination of "Henry V." II, The Origination of "Julius Cæsar." III, The authorship of "Richard III." $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$, xvi. + 205 pp. Routledge. 1922. 12s. 6d. n.

Croce as Shakespearean Critic. By J. M. ROBERTSON. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, 32 pp. Routledge 2s. 6d. n.

The Stager of Shakespeare. By R. CROMPTON RHODES. Birmingham: Cornish. 1922. 4s. 6d. n.

The Life of Henry, Third Earl of Southampton, Shakespeare's Patron. By CHARLOTTE CARMICHAEL STOPES. 1922. Cambridge University Press. 42s. net.

A Bibliography of William Blake. By GEOFFREY KEYNES. New York. The Grolier Club.

Lord Byron's Correspondence. Chiefly with Lady Melbourne, Mr. Hobhouse, the Hon. Douglas Kinnaird, and P. B. Shelley. Edited by JOHN MURRAY. In two volumes. $8\frac{3}{4} \times 6$. Volume I. xiii. + 308. Volume II. ix. + 326 pp. Murray, 1922. 25s. n.

The Social Philosophy of Carlyle and Ruskin. By FREDERICK WILLIAM ROE. $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$, vii. + 335 pp. Allen and Unwin. 1922. 12s. 6d. n.

The Home Life of Swinburne. By CLARA WATTS-DUNTOW. Philpot, 1922. 15/- net.

A History of American Literature. Edited by W. P. TRENT, J. ERSKINE, STUART P. SHERMAN, and CARL VAN DOREN. Vol. III., x. + 424 pp. Vol. IV., vi. + 425 pp. to 872. 9½ × 6. Cambridge University Press. 30s. net.

The history is now brought down to the latest days in all departments of American literature. About one-half of the fourth volume is taken up by a great bibliography. [T.]

The American Novel. By CARL VAN DOREN. Macmillan, 1921. 11/- net.

Convention and Revolt in Poetry. By JOHN LIVINGSTON LAVES. 7¾ × 5¼, 346 pp. Constable. 12s. 6d. n. [A review will appear.]

A Letter Book. Selected with an Introduction on the History and Art of Letter-Writing. By GEORGE SAINTSBURY. Bell. 1922. 6s. net.

The Exemplary Theatre. By HARLEY GRANVILLE-BARKER. 8½ × 5¼, xv. + 288 pp. Chatto and Windus. 9s. n.

Bibliographies of Modern Authors. No. 4. John Collings Squire and James Stephens. With a prefatory letter by J. C. SQUIRE. Compiled by I. A. WILLIAMS 7¼ × 5¾, 13 pp. Leslie Chandy. 1s. 6d. n.

Based on lists which appeared in the *London Mercury*.

Notes and Reviews. By HENRY JAMES. A collection of 25 papers hitherto unpublished in book form. Edition of 1000 copies only. Dunster House, Cambridge, Mass. \$ 5.-.

Jack London. By CHARMIAN LONDON (Mrs. Jack London). In two volumes. 9 × 6. Vol. I., xiii. + 450 pp. Vol. II., viii. + 418 pp. Mills and Boon. 36s. n.

Tendencies in Modern American Poetry. By AMY LOWELL. Reprint. 8vo 8¾ × 5¾. pp. 364. Blackwell, 1921. 12s. 6d. net.

Prejudices. Second Series. By H. L. MENCKEN. 8 × 5½, 254 pp. Jonathan Cape. 7s. 6d. n.

The Kinds of Poetry and other essays. By JOHN ERSKINE. New-York, Duffield, 1920. [A review will appear.]

The Year's Work in English Studies, 1919-'20. Edited for the English Association by SIR SIDNEY LEE. Oxford University Press. 1921. 140 pp. Price 3/6 for Members.

Essays and Studies. By Members of the English Association. Volume VII. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1921. 7/6 net.

Contains six essays: Rhyme in English Poetry by B. de Selincourt. — Words and Music in Song by A. H. Fox Strangways. — Thomas Farnell. or What was Wrong with the Eighteenth Century by A. H. Crickshank. — A Contemporary Light upon John Donne by John Sampson. — A Bundle of Ballads by Geo. Neilson. — The 1604 text of Marlowe's 'Doctor Faustus' by Percy Simpson.

LINGUISTICS, HISTORY, EDUCATION.

An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary. Based on the manuscript collections of the late Joseph Bosworth. Supplement. By NORTHCOTE TOLLER. Part. III: Geolwian, Ypung. Oxford University Press. 31/6 net.

The Corpus, Epinal, Erfurt and Leyden Glossaries. By W. M. LINDSAY, F. B. A. Publications of the Philological Society, VIII. Oxford University Press, 1921. 15/- net. [A review will appear.]

The Oxford English Dictionary. Edited by SIR JAMES A. H. MURRAY, HENRY BRADLEY, W. A. CRAIGIE, and C. T. ONIONS. 13½ × 10¾. Vol. X., U.-Z. Unforeseeable. By W. A. CRAIGIE. 192 pp. 15s. n. W-Wash, by HENRY BRADLEY. 128 pp. 10s. n. Z-Zyxt, by C. T. ONIONS. 170 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 10s. n.

A Dictionary of English Phrases. By ALBERT M. HYAMSON. 8¾ × 6, xvi. + 365 pp. Routledge. 12s. 6d. n.

Mood and Tense of the English Verb. By H. POOTSMA. Noordhoff. 1922. 91 pp. and 138 pp. f 5.90, cloth f 6.50. [See Review.]

A Handbook of Present-Day English. Volume II. English Accidence and Syntax. By E. KRUSINGA. Third Edition. Kemink & Zoon. 1922. XXXI + 912 pp., cloth f 19.50. [See Review.]

On Hyphens and Shall and Will and Should and Would in the newspapers of to-day. By H. W. FOWLER. Correspondence. &c., by GEORGE SAINTSBURY, ROBERT GRAVES, JOHN SARGAUNT. (S.P.E. Tract No. VI.) 9¼ × 5¾, 29 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 2s. 6d. n.

English Influence on the French Vocabulary. By PAUL BARBIER. (S.P.E. Tract No. VIII.) 9 × 6, 44 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 3s. 6d. n. [A review will appear.]

Language. Its nature, development, and origin. By OTTO JESPERSEN. $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$, 448 pp. Allen and Unwin. 18s. n. [A review will appear.]

The American Language. An inquiry into the development of English in the United States. By H. L. MENCKEN. $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$, xvii + 492 pp. Jonathan Cape. 30s. n.

Transactions of the Scottish Dialects Committee. No. IV. $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$, 90 pp. William Grant (Editor), Ashfield, Culls, Aberdeen.

Containing General Vocabulary, P-Y.

Angvin Britain and Scandinavia. By HENRY GODDARD LEACH. (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature.) $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$, xi. + 432 pp. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press. London: Milford. 15s. n.

A painstaking investigation into the medieval relations between the literatures of the British and Scandinavian countries, the study for which Mr. Leach, who is secretary of the American Scandinavian Foundation, began some fifteen years ago on the suggestion of Professor W. H. Schofield. It starts with a chapter on the Scandinavian settlement of Britain, and examines many varied kinds of literature and culture—the work of the Churchmen, Court manuals, pseudo histories, books of instruction, legends, ballads, sagas, &c. With notes (21 pp.) at the end. [T.]

The Beginning of the Year in the Middle Ages. By REGINALD LANE POOLE, Fellow of the Academy. $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$, 25 pp. For the British Academy. Milford. 3s. n.

England under the Lancastrians. By JESSIE H. FLEMMING. With a preface by A. F. POLLARD. $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, xxi. + 301 pp. Longmans. 12s. 6d. n.

This is a "Source Book" — one of the University of London Intermediate Source Books of History of which "Chaucer's England" and "England Under the Yorkists" have already appeared. It provides a continuous series of contemporary documents from 1399 to 1423, with preliminary "Notes on the Sources" and index, 13 pp. [T.]

The Pastons and their England. Studies in an age of transition. By H. S. BENNETT. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6$, xx. + 289 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1922. 15s. n.

The Elizabethans and the Empire. By A. F. POLLARD, Fellow of the Academy. The Raleigh Lecture on History. $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$, 20 pp. For the British Academy. Milford. 1s. 6d. n.

The Fall of Mary Stuart. A Narrative in Contemporary Letters. By FRANK ARTHUR MUMBY. Constable. 18/- net.

PERIODICALS.

De Drie Talen. Febr. & March 1922. L. P. H. Eykman, De plaats van *little* in verbanding met een ander bijvoeglijk naamwoord.

Revue germanique. XIII, 1. Janv. — Mars 1922. Includes: D. Saurat, Milton et le Zohar.

Modern Language Review. XVII, 1. Jan. 1922. Includes: W. L. Renwick, The critical origins of Spenser's diction. — R. S. Crane, Richardson, Warburton and French fiction. — R. S. Loomis, Tristram and the House of Anjou. — K. Hayens, Heine, Hazlitt and Mrs. Jameson.

Modern Language Notes. XXXVII, 1. Jan. 1922. Includes: C. T. Goode, Sir Thomas Elyot's *Titus and Gysippus*. — A. H. Nethercot, The term "Metaphysical Poets" before Johnson. — R. S. Crane, An early 18th c. enthusiast for primitive poetry: John Husbands.

Id. XXXVII, 2. Febr. 1922. Includes: A. H. Tolman, Shakespeare's Manipulation of his sources in *As You Like It*. — F. B. Snyder, Notes on Burns and England. — H. Cummings, Chaucer's *Prologue*, 1-7. — L. R. Merrill, Vaughan's influence upon Wordsworth's poetry.

Id. XXXVII, 3. March 1922. M. Callaway, The dative of time how long in Old English. — M. H. Nicolson, More's *Psychozoia*. — A. A. Raven, A study in Masefield's vocabulary. — A. A. Kern, *King Lear* and *Pelleas and Ettare*. — O. S. Coad, An old American college play. — A. W. Crawford, A note on *Julius Caesar*.

Philological Quarterly. ¹ I, 1. Jan. 1922. Includes: Th. A. Knott, Chaucer's Anonymous Merchant. — E. N. S. Thompson, Between the *Shepherds Calender* and *The Seasons*. — H. S. Hughes, A Dialogue — Possibly by Henry Fielding. — J. S. Kenyon, A Note on Hamlet.

Neuere Sprachen. XXIX, 9/10 (Dec. 1921). F. Karpf, Syntax-Studien II (Notes on Jespersen). — K. Glaser, Zum bedeutungswandel in Französischen. — Notes, including a protest by the Romance professor Lerch against the ignorance of scholarship prevalent among German secondary schoolmasters, and their preference for schoolbooks produced by colleagues who are innocent of scholarship and reproduce statements long since proved to be wrong. — Reviews.

¹ Published at the University of Iowa: \$ 2.00 a year.

Fruit from the Golden Bough.

I.

Whatever may be the ultimate truth of the well-known Lucretian proposition that nothing arises out of nothing, it certainly holds good of literature and art. But the principle, being so very obvious, is in constant danger of being overlooked. We think it only natural that novelists and playwrights should always endeavour to obtain material at first hand; should make it a rule to observe human nature in as many aspects as possible; should familiarize themselves with many points of view, with various outlooks on life, with several 'philosophies', whether articulate or inarticulate. We consider it their main business to order and shape, to refine and sublimate this material, and we are quite willing, after they have done their business well, to hail them as genuine *creators*. On the other hand we are apt to forget that literary genres, plots and *motifs* must likewise derive, ultimately, from real facts, occurrences, practices, coincidences; notwithstanding all subsequent embroideries and embellishments, and in spite of the popular tendency to magnify or reduce proportions. There is something unsatisfactory in the mere tracing of mutual indebtedness, in being rewarded for one's pains by the rather barren knowledge that Tom borrowed from Dick, who borrowed from Harry, who borrowed from Jack; and that Tom was merely a transcriber and Dick a careless copyist, whereas brilliantly imaginative Harry transmuted Jack's ore into shining and resounding metal. To be sure we ought never to sneer at those patient and painstaking scholars who, as often as not in the self-sacrificing spirit of Browning's Gramscarian, devote their lives to such wearisome and seemingly unprofitable tasks. But after all, we are in duty bound not to ignore the question which like a cliff, forbidding and fascinating at once, rises up at the end, the question of the provenance of Jack's ore. May not a good pick-axe, wielded by energetic hands, accomplish something, and at any rate lay bare certain veins?

II.

Many are the pickaxes, divers are the ways in which they are wielded by the attackers of the cliff, and various are the spots chosen for the attack. A Schliemann hearing the tale of Troy will refuse to accept it as fiction, as a mere story invented by a glorious but untruthful bard to beguile the time of the chieftain whose hospitable roof sheltered him, and at whose well-provided board — below the salt most likely — he fed. Convinced that there must have been some foundation of truth underlying the fabric of fancy, convinced also that even the fiercest sack and the most devastating fire cannot have caused total annihilation of what once was, he will, as soon as Mammon and circumstances permit him, rush to the place to which tradition points, locate the spot, conduct excavations, and discover the authentic remains of bygone splendour, thereby confounding — not, alas, for ever — wiseacres and pseudo-sceptics and dissuaders of unsophisticated enthusiasm. But archæology is one pick-axe from among

several, and its method has to be supplemented by others. Though archaeological finds certainly shed invaluable light on extant texts, it is just as necessary to interpret the former in the light of the latter. Admitting that we moderns are such stuff as dreams are made of, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the minds of our far-off predecessors, whose wonted fires live on in our ashes, were not made of sterner material than ours, rather the contrary, and that psychology, the scientific exploration of those overlapping realms called the conscious and the unconscious, should prove of inestimable service in explaining what our predecessors thought; how they felt; how they responded to their environment and to the calls from *their* past. So psychology joins hands with anthropology, which in its turn is inseparably connected with economics, with the study of religious beliefs, and with folklore, i. e. the study of religious survivals and the *débris* of 'science' that has fallen on evil days.

An author, when asked what made him take to writing, will as a rule fob us off with the statement that it was just because the fancy took him. If he happens to be in a cynical mood, he may say that it was merely to get some badly needed *shekels*. Ribot (*Essai sur l'Imagination Créatrice*, Paris 1908), after proving that there is no creative instinct as such, goes on to state (page 262) that needs and desires, whether single or combined must furnish the creative impulse, *but that they cannot furnish more*. If something is to be produced or 'created' there must be spontaneous re-emergence of submerged mental images. And how did we come by these mental images? The answer is: we received them from without, and the rule holds good for every *homo sapiens*, including inventors, discoverers, artists and poets. We received them from without, either directly, from the visible world of sky and clouds, sun, moon and stars, trees, grass and flowers, folk at work, at play, at worship, — or through the medium of what we were told, by parents and nurses, comrades and teachers. And whether or no we were told the results of observation at first hand — as a matter of fact we were mostly steeped in the stream of tradition — the effect on our minds remained much the same in kind, one image being as 'good' as another so long as there is equal intensity. But equal intensity there seldom is, and this truth applies both to the separate images lodged in one and the same mind, and to the separate *complexes* of mental imagery owned by different individuals. And those persons who, experiencing a creative impulse, have a great body of intense images at their disposal, and who, by using the telling word in the place where it tells most, can evoke similar moods to theirs in other people, are word-artists, or, in the higher sense of the term, poets.

As regards mental imagery we may consider it a debatable point whether a poet owes a greater debt to his actual surroundings or to tradition. But there is one respect in which the part played by tradition cannot be overestimated: it provides the *form* that the poet wants, it supplies the *mould* in which he can cast and fix part of his chaotically fluid fancies. He may, it is true — and as a rule he will — meddle with it, tinker at it, modify it to suit his needs or his idiosyncrasies, and afterwards hand on a rather different mould to his poetical successor, who in his turn will introduce certain modifications, however slight. But no literary form ever sprang Minerva-like out of an author's pregnant brain. And most literary artists have been glad to avail themselves of existing forms which were ready to their hands. Neither Shakespeare nor Goethe invented anything new in the way of *moulds*. There is many a modern sonneteer and unlocker

of his heart who, in the eighteenth century, would have devoted himself to didacticism, and the host of modern novelists would in Elizabethan times have gone in for the manufacture of plays.

III.

How had the Elizabethans come by their dramatic forms? They owed a considerable debt to the Mediæval moralities and mysteries, likewise to Spain, and to Seneca. And Seneca was, as a matter of course, indebted to the Greeks. What about the latter? Were they not borrowers as well?

They were, says Sir James Frazer of the 'Golden Bough'. They were huge borrowers, in matters religious. — And therefore, say Miss Jane Harrison, Professor Gilbert Murray and the rest, they were likewise borrowers in the field of art and letters. For in olden times there was no line of cleavage between religion and art, and whoever investigates the origins of Greek literature becomes *nolens volens* an inquirer into Hellenic religious beliefs. His researches will often yield startling results, which it will be necessary to supplement and verify by an assiduous comparison with the beliefs and magical rites of such primitive peoples as the ploughshare of advancing civilization has spared as yet. A practically endless field of investigation opens, with innumerable possibilities of losing one's way or pursuing will-o'-the-wisps....

But surely, some reader will say, we know all about *die Götter Griechenlands*. We know their pedigrees, their functions, their attributes. We are familiar with their outward appearances. If we were to meet them in the street, we should recognise them sooner than Philemon and Baucis did....

Let me disabuse such readers at once. Homeric mythology is not Greek religion, and the appeal of Homer's gods was, already in Homer's time, far more æsthetic than religious or ethical. In Jane Harrison's beautiful words (see the Introduction to her *Themis*, Cambridge, 1912) the anthropomorphic gods of Homer and Pheidias and the mythographers are 'like a bouquet of cut flowers whose bloom is brief, because they have been severed from their roots'. In the religious life of the Greeks the figures of Adonis, Orpheus, and Dionysus loom far larger than all the Olympians together, with the only exception of Demeter. And who were Adonis, Orpheus, Dionysus? They were more than men, were they gods? And if so, had they been gods from the first?

According to the school of Sir James Frazer they were, though undoubtedly borrowing certain traits from actual personages, essentially *year-spirits*, representing the cyclic death and rebirth of the world. And their myths, originating in rites of so-called sympathetic magic, contained a number of elements whose normal sequence is as follows (Themis, 342):

1. An *Agon* or Contest, the Year against its enemy, Light against Darkness, Summer against Winter.

2. A *Pathos* of the Year-Daimon, generally a ritual or sacrificial death, in which Adonis or Attis is slain by the taboo animal, Dionysus, Pentheus, Orpheus, Hippolytus torn to pieces.

3. A *Messenger* announcing that Great Pan, or Tammuz or Adonis, has died ('off the stage').

4. A *Threnos* or Lamentation (often after the dead body is brought in on a bier).

5. *A. Theophany*, when the Daimon, thought to be dead, reappears in glory and is recognised by his worshippers, who experience a *Peripateia* or extreme change of feeling, from the deepest grief to the highest joy.

Now these were rites in which at first it behoved every freeborn citizen to join, but by and by, as the *civitas* increased, active participation of every member of the community was no longer desirable and mere presence was considered enough. The *Sacer Ludus* became the business of a few characters, chiefly of the two *antagonists*, assisted by a chorus. Successive years brought more changes. It was forgotten that the two adversaries were in reality one, both being the embodied representatives of one and the same conception, the Year-spirit. It was forgotten that the Dionysus of one year was the Pentheus of the next, and that originally the *sin* of the latter, so far from being *hubris*, arrogance or insolence, was simply — that he was old, that he was a dog who had had his day, that the New Year made his triumphal entry over the mangled and torn remains of his defeated rival. But though one gifted dramatist might develop the old play in some special direction, and though successors in their turn might add new elements and introduce new departures, the outer shape did not lose its identity. From first to last Greek tragedy was essentially religious and retained the clear traces of its origin in ritual. And attendance on the part of the citizens remained compulsory. And the priest of Dionysus continued to occupy the seat of honour among the spectators, year after year.

IV.

The above views are now held by many scholars, most of whom, be it noted here, have a pronounced turn for literary expression. (I mention especially Professor Gilbert Murray). But the theory has not been allowed to go unchallenged, and it is especially the Cambridge professor Sir William Ridgeway, the well-known author of *The Dramas and Dramatic Dances of Non-European Races* (a valuable book and a mine of information), who has proved himself the staunchest and most indefatigable denier of all Year-spirits and *Vegetation-daimons*. He holds, as strongly as possible:

1. That Tragedy proper did not arise in the worship of Dionysus.
2. That, on the contrary, it sprang out of the indigenous worship of the dead.
3. That even if it were true that Tragedy proper arose out of the worship of Dionysus, it would no less have originated in the worship of the dead, since Dionysus was regarded by the Greeks as a *hero* (i. e. a man turned into a saint) as well as a god.

Unfortunately, however, the arguments by means of which Sir William Ridgeway supports his views, are not always of a kind likely to impress a literary man with some knowledge of linguistics. This is not to say that none of his arguments will hold water — in fact, many of them are not easily disposed of — but simply that in his Berserker-like fight with his opponents he will not only make any weapon do, but will sometimes try to cut with a broomstick and to shoot with a wooden gun. Let it be granted that Max Müller and his school were wrong in seeing solar myths everywhere and in constructing a primitive 'Aryan' language consisting of nothing but abstract verbal roots. Does it therefore follow that there never were any solar myths, not even among the Babylonians, and that all verbs are

denominatives? ¹⁾ Is it logical in one place to deny uncultured persons any power of abstraction or generalization, and in another to pooh-poo the possibility of so-called group projections, the theory that Bacchus was simply *the* Bacchus *par excellence* and arose out of a group, a *thiasos* whom he led and represented, just as *the* MacTavish led and represented his clan? Why, uncultured people cannot so much as think without personifications, group-projections and so forth. Like the lunatic, the lover and the poet, they are of imagination all compact, and if they would but apprehend some joy, or fear, or sorrow, they comprehend its bringer, Shakespeare's psychology is rather ahead of Professor Ridgeway's here. What about the conceptions, many in number, which German scholars, following Hermann Usener, term *Sondergötter*, about Keurotrophos, the divine nurse of children, about Thallo and Auxo, granting youthful bloom and increase, about Matton, the kneader of bread, Keraon, the mixer of wine, and the *Mulanteioi* in the mills? ²⁾ What about the inveterate habit of uneducated people of speaking of *the* Frenchman (or of Johnny Crapaud) where an educated man would make the indefinite article do? What about Uncle Sam and John Bull? What about Father Christmas? And what about that wonderful *compositum mixtum* invented in the United States and bearing that weirdest of all names, Santa Claus?

V.

He is not our Dutch *Sinterklaas* or Saint Nicholas, as his grotesque appellation seems to suggest, and as some misguided lexicographers would make us believe. We disown the upstart. Yankees and Britishers may galvanize him into seeming life and even identify him with Father Christmas, we stick to our good old Bishop, who, on December 5th (mark the date), visits us even in the most inclement weather, and having left his beautiful castle in Spain comes to us with a shipload of gifts; to our venerable, whitebearded, crozier-bearing Bishop, who is not above inspecting schools and rewarding children in their class-rooms, when, leaving his palfrey outside pawing the ground, he enters in all the majesty of benevolence, followed by his black servant, whose bent back threatens to break under the weight of a mammoth hamper crammed with presents.... Oh, the shouts that then rise in token of the inextinguishable love that we bear him!

Now St. Nicholas, popular though he is with Catholics and Protestants alike, can hardly be looked upon as an ancestor of the Dutch, being a bishop and vowed to celibacy. But what if he, even he, were in reality a supplanter, like Jacob, and a *compositum mixtum*, like Santa Claus? What

¹⁾ I give Prof. Ridgeway's reasoning *verbatim*. 'They... assumed that the primitive Aryans could do perfectly what few most cultured people of to-day can only do imperfectly — think in abstracts. Yet they might have remembered that so far from verbal roots being antecedent to nouns even in Sanskrit and Greek there are whole classes of *denominative* verbs, i. e. verbs derived from nouns and that living languages are daily recruiting their verbal system by new formations from previously existing nouns, thus demonstrating that the names for objects come first, and that verbs and verbal roots are derived from them. There must be a Captain Boycott before there can be a verb to boycott.' — I submit that this sort of logic is unsound.

²⁾ As regards the Romans, Cyril Bailey (*The Religion of Ancient Rome*, Constable, 1911) gives (page 13), on Varro's authority, a list of the deities concerned in the early life of the child. 'There is Vaticanus, who opens the child's mouth to cry, Cunina, who guards his cradle, Edulia and Potina, who teach him to eat and drink, Statilinus, who helps him to stand up, Adeona and Abeona, who watch over his first footsteps, and many others each with his special province of protection or assistance.'

if several of his traits were borrowed from some pagan predecessor, perhaps even from more than one? For St. Nicholas's gallant dapple-grey is no ordinary *equus caballus*. He can take his way through the air, through the sky, like — ay, like Sleipnir ridden by Woden. And when I was a little boy, being of conservative and benighted stock, I used, *mirabile dictu*, to bring sacrifices, not, it is true, to 'the Saint' or to Woden, but to the horse. Under the chimney, St. Nicholas's favourite way-in, I put a wooden shoe (specially provided for the occasion, for our Anglo-Saxon friends will be surprised to learn that our entire Dutch household trod on neat's leather) containing a big carrot or turnip for St. Nicholas's mount. In the morning such a vegetable would always have disappeared, having ostensibly found its way into Sleipnir's capacious stomach, but in its stead there would be presents lying about, a whistle, a paint-box, a picture book, building-blocks, — and always a *Klaasman*, a rather big effigy of St. Nicholas, baked of spiced flour, which I was on no account to consume by myself like little Jack Horner in his corner, but which, broken to pieces, was partaken of by everyone who had the slightest claim on me. All this would seem to point to some supplanted vegetation-god, who may have been much older than Woden himself, the *Klaasman* being the degraded relic of a kind of sacrament in the god's honour, shared by his worshippers, who knew as well as the ancient Greeks and Romans or the modern Chinese how to make *simulacra* do duty for *vera*.

Recommending this little excursus to the notice of Sir James Frazer, while observing that Sir William Ridgeway's ancestor-cult explains neither the *omophagia* of the Dionysus-worshippers (i. e. the combined slaughter and consumption, raw, of a bull or a goat) nor the breaking and dividing of the *Klaasman*, I will now proceed to give some quotations from Professor Emile Durkheim's well-known book *Les Formes élémentaires de la Vie religieuse* (Paris, 1912). It will be seen that this scholar, who is by no means a 'compleat' Frazerite, controverts Prof. Ridgeway's theories in the most unambiguous terms.

(p.p. 88, 89): "Si vraiment.... les premiers êtres sacrés avaient été les âmes des morts et le premier culte celui des ancêtres, on devrait constater que, plus les sociétés sont d'un type inférieur, plus aussi ce culte tient de place dans la vie religieuse. Or c'est plutôt le contraire qui est la vérité. Le culte ancestral ne prend de développement et même ne se présente sous une forme caractérisée que dans des sociétés avancées comme la Chine, l'Égypte, les cités grecques et latines; au contraire, il manque aux sociétés australiennes qui représentent la forme d'organisation sociale la plus basse et la plus simple que nous connaissions. Sans doute, on y trouve des rites funéraires et des rites de deuil; mais ces sortes de pratiques ne constituent pas un culte, bien qu' on leur ait parfois, et à tort, donné ce nom. Un culte, en effet, n'est pas simplement un ensemble de précautions rituelles que l'homme est tenu de prendre dans certaines circonstances; c'est un système de rites, de fêtes, de cérémonies diverses qui *présentent toutes ce caractère qu'elles reviennent périodiquement.*"

And again (p. 91):

"L' Australien n'est occupé de ses morts qu' au moment même du décès et pendant le temps qui suit immédiatement. Et cependant, ces mêmes peuples pratiquent, à l' égard d'êtres sacrés d'une tout autre nature, un culte complexe, fait de cérémonies multiples

qui occupent parfois des semaines et même des mois entiers. Il est inadmissible que les quelques rites que l'Australien accomplit quand il lui arrive de perdre l'un de ses parents aient été l'origine de ces cultes permanents, qui reviennent régulièrement tous les ans et qui remplissent une notable partie de son existence. Le contraste entre les uns et les autres est même tel qu'on est fondé à se demander *si ce ne sont pas les premiers qui sont dérivés des seconds, si les âmes des hommes, loin d'avoir été le modèle sur lequel furent imaginés les dieux, n'ont pas été conçues, dès l'origine, comme des émanations de la divinité.*" (my italics).

VI.

"In any half-won sphere of knowledge that hypothesis must hold the field which correlates the largest number of known facts." Accepting this truth, thus felicitously framed by Miss Bertha Phillpotts, the author of *The Elder Edda and Ancient Scandinavian Drama* (Cambridge, 1920), which will now be discussed, we must take leave of the funeral theory ¹⁾. It would, of course, be quite wrong altogether to reject it, but the number of facts which it correlates is too small to induce any admirer of *The Golden Bough* to give up Frazer's hypotheses in favour of Ridgeway's. A careful reading of the distinguished archaeologist's book will leave a good many readers impenitent believers in the existence of vegetation-rites and fertility-cults. Indeed, supposing one's belief had been shaken, would not one bite off the *Klaasman* or one glance at the sculptured obscenities of certain Hindoo temples suffice to confirm it again?

But our business is now with Scandinavia.

"At the dawn of history," says Miss Phillpotts (p. 64), "we find the Northerners with two extremes in literary modes; the speech-poem and the purely narrative skaldic verse. The former is evidently of native origin: the latter has often been suspected of Celtic affinities." The subject-matter of the skaldic poems came from the south; the Norwegians play no part in the Nibelungen and Ermanaric cycles. They are outside them "as the Ionians are outside the purview of the Homeric Age". At the time when Goths, Franks and Saxons were exulting in the possession of lands and wealth wrested from the Romans, the Norwegians were probably too poor to attract the foreign Court minstrel with all the heroic songs of Teutondom stored in his memory. "But when, on the decay of the Frisian sea-power, the Norwegians won a sudden affluence, we may imagine that foreign minstrels were glad to frequent the courts of her kings.... An alien heroic

¹⁾ The following two sneers at it are not without point:

1. [On the funeral theory a ritual myth] "must represent those exploits of the dead chieftain, of which his ghost will most like to be reminded; and it is difficult to understand what satisfaction the departed Pelops could find in having his attention periodically drawn to the fact that his father had been damned in Hell for cooking him and trying to make the gods eat him at dinner." (Mr. F. M. Cornford in Jane Harrison's *Themis*, Cambridge, 1912, page 217).

2. "It is perfectly obvious that Sir W. Ridgeway's theory, reduced to abstract terms, would result in the conclusion that all religion is based upon the cult of the Dead and that men originally knew no gods but their grandfathers, a theory from which as a student of religion I absolutely and entirely dissent. I can understand that such Dead Ancestors can be looked upon as Protectors, or as Benefactors. But I see no ground for supposing that they have ever been regarded as Creators...." (Jessie Weston, *From Ritual to Romance*, Cambridge, 1920).

poetry was grafted upon Norwegian literature and flowered a second time in Norway and in Iceland.' As Professor Chadwick was the first to point out, 'the Norwegians, like the Ionians, were the means of transmitting to posterity, in a style and metre they did not invent, the heroic poetry of an age in which they played no part. They glorify their own greatness by bringing a finer art to bear on the exploits of an age in which they were unknown and unsung, just as the author of Beowulf honours his Anglo-Saxon king by stories of a heroic age in distant Scandinavia.'

Bertha Phillpotts's concern is not with the skalds, but with the older poems, which consist of little but speech and which shirk narrative; with *Fafnismál* for instance, depicting in dialogue form, Sigurd's slaying of the dragon and his detection of Reginn's treachery, when, after a great deal of dialogue, only a prose "aside" tells us that "*Sigurd hewed the head off Reginn*". This clumsy and long-winded dialogue form, contrasting so sharply with the forcible directness and economy of the Icelandic prose-sagas, must have an origin, and Miss Phillpotts finds this origin in ancient ritual. We know that vegetation and fertility rites played a large part in the religious life of the Scandinavians. We know that among various peoples such rites tended to assume dramatic forms, which often, albeit debased and degraded in character, have persisted down to our days. We may assume *a priori* that such dramas were likewise enacted among Northmen, Danes and Swedes. And it is notorious that primitive drama is by no means composed solely with a view to entertainment. 'If the Norwegians performed a special type of dramatic representation in which a god, usually Thor, is victorious in a contest with a giant, we may suppose that they first did so as a means of securing that Thor should in fact always be successful in those encounters with a race which for ever threatened the security of the world.' Likewise the primary object of the fertility-drama proper, the so-called ritual marriage, was not commemorative but magical, and it was performed to induce the earth to bring forth abundantly. And though in the Edda as well as in Saxo these ritual dramas have been treated as heroic sagas, these poems present a certain number of special characteristics (proper to the Year-Drama), which Bertha Phillpotts enumerates as follows (page 144):

(1) A slaying by the bridegroom. The slain man is a kinsman of either bride or bridegroom, usually a brother.

(2) The implication that this slaying is in some way the bride's doing, the woman being the central figure.

(3) A flying, or scolding-match.

(4) A love-scene, sometimes followed by hints of resurrection.

The *agonists*, too, are a peculiar set, and often bear names which are generic rather than proper, such as Helgi (= the holy one), Heðinn (= the skin-clad one), Gram (= the adversary), whilst the woman is often called a *valkyrie*. From a literary point of view the ancient Norwegians seem strangely deficient in inventive power, but a student of anthropology will be pretty quick to reject any theory of literary contamination. In face of such a number of variations on a common theme, he will look for the basis of the story in some oft-repeated piece of ritual. The flying is easily accounted for, as it also occurs as an integral part of Greek comedy, where its intention may have been either a crop-charm or an attempt to avert evil. But the many Helgis remind one of the kings or high-priests of Cybele at Pessinus, who were regularly called Attis, beloved of the *mater turrigera*. In Sweden the name *Yngvi* was borne not only by the god Frey

himself, but by every member of the royal house of Upsala, and it is inferred that these princes were regarded not merely as descendants, but actually as representatives of the god. 'Thus every Upsala king would be regarded as representing Frey in his quality of Freyja's husband.... When the country suffered from famine, the disaster was attributed to the king, who was thus credited with the same powers as Frey. We may surmise that at such times the goddess was thought to be dissatisfied with her human bridegroom, and when this occurred he was sacrificed and another of the royal house succeeded him.... *It looks as if the king's reign would normally terminate with his death at the hands of a member of his own family, who would succeed to the kingship and the espousals*'. (My italics). Shakespeare's Hamlet derives ultimately from Saxo Grammaticus. It is not difficult to see how Saxo had come by the story, whose meaning of course escaped him altogether. As regards the central figures of these 'dramas' the female characters, we may presume that they — Thorgerdh, Sigrún, Svava and the rest — were priestesses personating the goddess in her marriages with members of the royal house.

VII.

'If by focussing attention upon some neglected aspect of the Eddic poems, while availing ourselves to the full of the results of philological research, ¹⁾ we are driven to formulate a new theory for the origin of the poems, we are furthering the advance of knowledge, whether the theory is ultimately proved right or no.' This is Bertha Phillpotts's position. Substitute 'Grael romances' for 'Eddic poems' and we have Miss Weston's in *From Ritual to Romance* (Cambridge, 1920), a work which she evidently intends to be the crowning achievement of more than thirty years devoted to the study of Mediæval texts. To use a phrase which has become rather hackneyed of late, what Miss Weston does not know about the Grail legend and Arthurian romance is not worth knowing. She quotes all her texts in the original, whether Provençal or Middle-Dutch, and has evidently more than a mere nodding acquaintance with Jacob van Maerlant. Now, after a great amount of valuable philological work, she has done what Miss Phillpotts has done: used Frazer's theories in order to unravel a very complicated and tangled web, in her case that of the extant Grail romances, and her task has been the more formidable of the two, owing to the overwhelming mass of material, both in prose and verse, 'a chaotic welter of conceptions that have come drifting from all parts of the globe'. ²⁾

There are scholars who see in it a deliberate attempt on the part of monks and clerics to infuse a Christian spirit into the warlike and amorous stories of chivalry. But if the attempt were deliberate it has been hardly more successful than the supplanting of Woden and Sleipnir by St. Nicholas and his palfrey. Why, for instance, is there, in Mediæval art, not a trace of the legend concerning Joseph of Arimathea and the Grail? It is true, Jessie Weston's statement, that the legend 'has no existence outside the Grail literature', and that it is 'the creation of romance, and no genuine tradition', might appear to be somewhat sweeping, as Joseph is mentioned

¹⁾ As a matter of fact Miss Phillpotts defers throughout, in matters philological, to such acknowledged authorities as Symons and R. Heusler.

²⁾ I quote the Copenhagen professor Dr. Valdemar Vedel. (*Mittelalterliche Kulturideale* H. Teubner). 'Es ist das wildeste Durcheinander von Vorstellungen von überallher'. (p. 139).

in the (apocryphal) gospel of Nicodemus. But she distinguishes sharply between a *Saint-Sang* legend, and one about the *Graail*, and she is most likely right in doing so. Then, how to account for the curiously unorthodox tone of the Grail romances? Are we to assume their being influenced by the Knights-Templars and their doings, as Prof. Vedel does, who also believes, with Paulin Paris, that the main source of the unorthodoxy is to be found in the struggle for independence of the early British Church? As Miss Weston observes with great reason, 'the differences of that Church with Rome affected only minor points of discipline: the date of Easter, the fashion of tonsure of the clergy, nothing which touched vital doctrines of the Faith.' But as regards the Templars, she admits the great probability either of their having had a hand in the formation of the legend, or of their tragic and mysterious fate having furnished materials for it. At any rate, we must put it down to the materials rather than to the intentions of the romancing monks and clerics, if the Graal sagas contain unorthodox, heretical or un-Christian elements. It was psychologically impossible for them to build even a Chapel Perilous without suitable bricks; and they could not bake bricks without clay. Both consciously and subconsciously — to discriminate between the results of the two processes looks a tempting but still very distant task — they handled and refashioned their *Rohstoff*, which as often as not was not so *very* raw, being largely the *dissecta membra* of a vanished civilization. So do we find, incorporated in the walls of an Italian peasant's cottage, pieces of ancient masonry, taken from the ruins of some villa or temple.

Let me exemplify this by drawing attention to an adventure of Lancelot, to be found in *Perceval le Gallois ou le conte du Graal*, which is accessible to the general reader in Sebastian Evans's translation called *The High History of the Holy Graal*. (Everyman; I quote Branch X 3-6).

'The story saith that Lancelot went his way by strange lands and by forests to seek adventure, and rode until he found a plain land lying without a city that seemed to be of right great lordship. As he was riding by the plain land, he looketh toward the forest and seeth the plain fair and wide and the land right level. He rideth all the plain, and looketh toward the city and seeth great plenty of folk issuing forth thereof. And with them was there much noise of bag-pipes and flutes and viols and many instruments of music, and they came along the way wherein was Lancelot riding. When the foremost came up to him, they halted and redoubled their joy. 'Sir,' say they, 'Welcome may you be!' 'Lords,' saith Lancelot, 'Whom come ye to meet with such joy?' 'Sir,' say they, 'They that come behind there will tell you clearly that whereof we are in need.'

'Thereupon behold you the provosts and the lords of the city, and they come over against Lancelot. 'Sir,' say they, 'All this joy is made along of you, and all these instruments of music are moved to joy and sound of gladness for your coming,' 'But wherefore for me,' saith Lancelot. 'That shall you know well betimes,' say they. 'This city began to burn and to melt in one of the houses from the very same hour that our king was dead, nor might the fire be quenched, nor never will be quenched until such time as we have a king that shall be lord of the city and of the honour thereunto belonging, and on New Year's Day behoveth him to be crowned in the midst of the fire, and then shall the fire be quenched, for otherwise may it

never be put out nor extinguished. Wherefore have we come to meet you to give you the royalty, for we have been told that you are a good knight.' 'Lords', saith Lancelot, 'Of such a kingdom have I no need, and God defend me from it.' 'Sir,' they say, 'You may not be defended thereof, for you come into this land at hazard, and great grief would it be that so good and as you see this is were burnt and melted away by the default of one single man, and the lordship is right great, and this will be right great worship to yourself, that on New Year's Day you should be crowned in the fire and thus save this city and this great people, and thereof shall you have great praise.'

'Much marvelleth Lancelot of this that they say. They come round about him on all sides and lead him into the city. The ladies and damsels are mounted to the windows of the great houses and make great joy, and say the one to another. 'Look at the new king here that they are leading in. Now will he quench the fire on New Year's Day.' 'Lord!' say the most part, 'What great pity is it of so comely a knight that he shall end on such-wise!' 'Be still!' say the others. 'Rather should there be great joy that so fair city as is this should be saved by his death, for prayer will be made throughout all the kingdom for his soul for ever!' Therewith they lead him to the palace with right great joy and say that they will crown him. Lancelot found the palace all strown with rushes and hung about with curtains of rich cloths of silk, and the lords of the city all apparelled to do him homage. But he refuseth right stoutly, and saith that their king nor their lord will he never be in no such sort. Thereupon behold you a dwarf that entereth into the city, leading one of the fairest dames that be in any kingdom, and asketh whereof this joy and this murmuring may be. They tell him they are fain to make the knight king, but that he is not minded to allow them, and they tell him the whole manner of the fire.

'The dwarf and the damsel are alighted, then they mount up to the palace. The dwarf calleth the provosts of the city and the greater lords. 'Lords,' saith he, 'Sith that this knight is not willing to be king, I will be so willingly, and I will govern the city at your pleasure and do whatsoever you have devised to do.' 'In faith, sith that the knight refuseth this honour and you desire to have it, willingly will we grant it you, and he may go his way and his road, for herein do we declare him wholly quit.' Therewithal they set the crown on the dwarf's head, and Lancelot maketh great joy thereof. He taketh his leave, and they commend him to God, and so remounteth he on his horse and goeth his way through the midst of the city all armed. The dames and damsels say that he would not be king for that he had no mind to die so soon. When he came forth of the city right well pleased was he'

VIII.

Now any one who knows something of certain strange ways of heathen and pagan, will at once recognize in this adventure attributed to Lancelot, a pretty accurate version of a weird practice, which flourished among many

peoples in antiquity, likewise among the Aztecs of Mexico, and is still met with here and there in Africa, namely the ritual slaying of a man who had been crowned king, and who, having been given a shorter or longer period (a week, a month, a year, occasionally a term of years) during which to enjoy his privileged position to the full, being regarded with religious awe and being to all intents and purposes a god, — was burnt or otherwise sacrificed. The story was by no means a free invention, it was a very faithful tradition, and it had originated not in fancy but in fact. Miss Weston does not mention it, probably because she thinks its connection with the Grail too slender, in which she may be right; but its presence, which can in no other way be accounted for, lends additional weight to the thesis that the other elements, too, must have been derived from somewhere. And many are the elements whose provenance is traced by her, or for which she at least adduces parallels.

There is the king upon whose well-being the prosperity of a whole country depends, a notion with which Homer was already familiar (Cp. *Odyssey* XIX 108 ff) and by which the Romans were manifestly swayed when estimating the merits of their generals and consuls.¹⁾ When the Fisher King (li Rois Peschéors) 'falls into languishment', all the land suffers with him, vegetation is destroyed and desolation is everywhere.

There is the Grail itself, which, identified on the one hand with a mysterious Food-providing Vessel of the Kelts, on the other with the Chalice of the Eucharist, was originally but a 'life-symbol', like the lance, derived from some Hellenistic mystery-cult, or cults.

There is the Chapel Perilous, and the nightly vigil there, pointing, past or through the 'Order of the Temple', to the Mithra-worship of the Roman legionary, with its subterranean *Mithraeums* or chapels, built, as Cumont says, *in solo privato*, and with its rites of initiation and its seven degrees.²⁾ 'An interesting parallel exists between Wales, and localities, such as the Alps, and the Vosges, where we have definite proof that... Mystery cults lingered on after they had disappeared from public celebration. The Chart appended to Cumont's *Monuments de Mithra* shows Mithraic remains in precisely the locality where we have reason to believe certain of the *Gawain* and *Perceval* stories to have originated' (p. 179). 'The earliest version of the Grail story, represented by our Bleheris form, relates the visit of a wandering knight to one of these hidden temples; his successful passing of the test into the lower grade of Life initiation, his failure to attain to the highest degree. It matters little whether it were the record of an actual, or of a possible experience; the casting into romantic form of an event which the story-teller knew to have happened, and had perchance, actually witnessed; or the objective recital of what he knew *might* have occurred...' (p. 192). It *does* matter very little, from a psychological point of view, but surely, of an actual experience on the part of the narrator there can hardly be any question, since we have no trace of the story before the twelfth century,

¹⁾ Good fortune, whether in peace or war, was deemed a *virtue*. Compare Cicero's *Pro Murena* c. 18 § 38: "Quare gravis est illa oratio: 'me saucium recreavit, me praeda donavit: hoc duce castra cepimus, signa contulimus: nunquam iste plus militi laboris imposuit quam sibi sumpsit ipse, cum fortis tum etiam *felix*.' Hoc quanti putas esse ad famam hominum ac voluntatem? Etenim si tanta illis comitiis religio est, ut adhuc semper omen valuerit praerogativae, quid mirum est in hoc *felicitatis* famam sermonemque valuisse?" (My italics). Evidently Murena's *medicine* was strong.

²⁾ Raven (corax), *Occult* (cryphius), *Soldier* (miles), *Lion* (leo), *Persian* (Perses), *Courier of the Sun* (heliodromus) and *Father* (pater). See Cumont, *Les Mystères de Mithra* Brussels, 1913, p. 155.

and 'when we do meet with it, it is already in complete and crystallized form' (page 779), with which compare Van Gennep's dictum: "L'utilisation purement littéraire du thème a été, dans chaque système culturel (Grèce, avec les *Dialogues des Morts*; Rome avec l'*Énéide*; Moyen Age avec la *Divine Comédie*, etc.), l'oeuvre d'une période d'incroyance vis-à-vis de conceptions périmées." (*La Formation des Légendes*, Paris 1910, p. 104).

IX.

The theories discussed above, all of them fruit from Sir James Frazer's *Golden Bough*, are in our present state of knowledge entitled to every respect and worthy of all consideration. Their value to the anthropologist needs no comment. But their value to a mere *littérateur* is hardly less, since they help him to be on his guard against generalities and banalities, and against quasi-mystic 'talk through the hat' about the deep Slavic soul, and the brooding Keltic spirit and the rest of the modern catchwords, claptrap and *psittacism*.

WILLEM VAN DOORN.

The Dialectal Distribution of certain Phonological Features in Middle English.

Introduction.

§ 1. Previous Investigations.

The study of early Place-Name forms with a view to determine the geographical distribution of M.E. dialect features is as yet in its early stages, but the progress that has already been made in this line of research more than justifies its further development. Professor Wyld's articles on O.E. \ddot{y} in M.E. (*Englische Studien* 47. 1913-14) dealt with all the southern and midland counties. The same point, together with O.E. \bar{a}^1 (from W. Gmc. \bar{a}) was investigated by Professor Brandl (*Zur Geogr. der altengl. Dial.*). Ekwall (*Contrib. to the Hist. of O.E. Dialects*) traced the boundary of the O.E. area of the fracture of \bar{a} before $l + \text{consonant}$, and the distribution in M.E. of u , i , and e as the i mutation of \bar{a} ($e\bar{a}$) before $l + \text{consonant}$. Heuser's *Alt-London* deals chiefly with Middlesex, Essex, and Herts., and discusses the following phonological features: O.E. \bar{a} ; O.E. \ddot{y} ; fracture of \bar{a} before $l + \text{cons.}$; i -mutation of $a + \text{nasal}$.

Professor Wyld has shown (*Essays and Studies*, Vol. VI p.p. 114-119, etc.) that the results obtained from Pl. Ns. are confirmed by examination of literary texts in those counties to which such texts can be definitely assigned. Therefore in the case of other counties the conclusions drawn from Pl. Ns. may be accepted with some confidence, and as practically no smallest district in England is without its ancient records, there seems no reason why, as regards the phonological features at least, it should not be possible to establish M.E. dialect boundaries fairly accurately.

The field of research is almost unlimited. The enormous mass of material, both published and unpublished, that awaits in libraries and muniment

rooms the examination of the philologist, is an inexhaustible mine, and patient and careful search will doubtless reveal many surprises and many treasures.

§ 2. Difficulties.

There are, however, from the point of view of the investigator of dialects, a few difficulties to be faced. One possibility that must be reckoned with is that scribes may have sometimes used, not the local speech-forms, but some sort of official language, approximating more or less closely to the West Saxon, or the London English, or whatever may have been most in vogue in the official circles of the day. There is very little evidence of scribes from one part of the country employing their own local forms in names in other counties which normally used a different type. We do not find Kentish forms in Hereford, nor Hampshire pronunciations in Essex, and where apparent exceptions to the normal type do appear, it is always in such a small proportion as to be practically negligible.

It is perhaps rather dangerous to trust altogether to one manuscript to illustrate the speech-habits of a particular county, but in a general investigation like the present one it has to be done occasionally; as a matter of fact, in counties for which several manuscripts or groups of documents have been used, the evidence afforded is hardly ever conflicting. For some counties the wealth of easily accessible material is almost embarrassing, while in others the lack of suitable documents sometimes checks the development of a theory at an important point. The centuries for which the fewest Place-Name sources are forthcoming are the 11th and 12th, hence there is frequently a wide gap between the O.E. period and the M.E. period which remains to be bridged by future investigation. For the 12th century there is a large body of material in the Publications of the Pipe Roll Society, but the language of these is in some ways peculiar, and needs special examination.

In considering dialect features from a chronological point of view, we observe a tendency to preserve archaic forms of Place Names, particularly when the elements of which the Pl. Ns. are composed were not easily to be identified with the independent words. For instance, long after the time when Bedford must have adopted the pronunciation *calf* instead of *chalv* (> O.E. *cealf*) the name Chalgrave is invariably spelt with *ch-* (*Chalgraua*, etc. § 76), showing that the first element was no longer connected in the minds of the speakers with the ordinary word *calf*.

§ 3. Scope of the present investigation.

Four phonological features are here dealt with: 1) The fracture of *ǣ* before *l* + cons.; 2) The *i*-mutation of *ea* (> W. Gmc. *au*); 3) M.E. [y] from O.E. *eō*; 4) O.E. *ȳ* and *ȳ* + front cons. in M.E.

I have attempted in each case to trace the geographical distribution of the various types of pronunciation, indicating the varying boundary-line in the different centuries. Section I includes all the counties south of Shropshire, Staffs., Derby, Notts. and Lincoln; Section II the West-Midlands, South, and South-Midlands; Section III the West-Midlands and South-West.

§ 4. Chronological variation in the geographical distribution of phonological features.

It will be seen that the grouping of dialect features varies considerably in each county during the period covered by the following investigation. To give one instance of this, taken at random from the material given below, Devon in the 13th century has only fractured forms for O.E. *ǣ* before

l + cons., and for O.E. *ȝ* four times as many *i*- as there are *u*-spellings; while in the 14th century the fracture-forms have quite disappeared, and *u*- and *i*- forms for O.E. *ȝ* are in the proportion of 2 to 1. (§ 151).

Some features seem to have obtained at first over a very small area, and then spread widely over one county after another, completely ousting the types originally in use in these districts; other features appear at first distributed over a fairly large area, which is slowly contracted, until it finally disappears altogether. This gradual expansion and contraction can be traced in most of the dialect features here treated. Where the largest amount of material has been collected the development appears most regular; there are no very startling and abrupt changes of type, and divergencies from the normal are inconsiderable.

This variation in the distribution of dialectal characteristics makes it very often impossible, or at least dangerous, to draw conclusions about one period from material belonging to an earlier or a later one. Each century or half-century should be judged as far as possible on its own evidence, and that of other periods used only to confirm results thus obtained, or to supplement them when absolutely necessary.

§ 5. Reliability of the Old English Charters.

Since the main object of this investigation is to trace dialect boundaries in M.E., the material collected for the O.E. period is used chiefly as an introduction — an endeavour to follow back to their beginnings features which are important tests of dialect in M.E. I have employed for this purpose some of the O.E. charters, since these seemed to promise more detailed results, with regard to the different counties, than those that can be obtained from the literary texts.

One hundred and twenty charters have been examined, all of which seem to be genuine as far as their age is concerned. It may be questioned whether they really reflect the ordinary language of the districts to which they belong. But as it is chiefly from such documents as charters and wills that our knowledge of Early Kentish is derived, and as the old Suffolk and Surrey charters contain so many features evidently characteristic of the local dialects (Wylde: *Essays and Studies*. VI 125, 141), there is no reason why the charters of Worcester or Gloucester or Hampshire should not be equally reliable. There are certainly many West Saxon peculiarities in most of these documents, but those that come from a Non-W.S. area all have indications of what must be the true dialect forms, and it is from these more or less occasional spellings that our conclusions can be most safely drawn. Since the charters from counties belonging to the old Kingdom of Wessex (Hants., Dorset, Devon, Somerset, Wilts. and Berks.) apparently never deviate from the W.S. type, we cannot but believe that where traces of other types do occur, they are more to be depended on than the ordinary forms derived from a strict adherence to the W.S. scribal usage.

§ 6. Nature of Place-Name Sources.

These may be grouped in two classes: 1) Public official documents, such as the Hundred Rolls and Pipe Rolls, Feudal Aids and Inquisitions Post Mortem; and 2) Private official documents, such as title-deeds, rentals, and the grants of land, etc., collected in the monastic registers.

This last group, particularly the monastic chartularies, is perhaps the most valuable. Though the records are for the most part in Latin they contain numbers of Place-Names — towns, villages, woods, fields, etc. — and occasionally a transcript of an Old English charter, done into thirteenth

or fourteenth century English by the scribe who copied it. (See for instance the Liber de Hyda, the Chertsey Chartulary, and the Registrum Album of Bury St. Edmunds).

I have used these registers wherever possible, and supplemented them by other documents. The general collections of deeds and writs contained in the Cat. Anc. Dds., Cal. Inq., etc., have been used chiefly to fill up gaps in the material; there is still a vast amount of information to be gained from them concerning almost every county.

The documents and articles which I have consulted are more numerous than would appear from the following pages. Owing to lack of space, I have been obliged to omit a fairly large amount of the material collected. For the same reason, I have not, except in certain cases, given the Place-Names in full, nor full references to page, etc., but have merely indicated the number of times each element occurs in Pl. Ns. in a particular document, and shown the proportion between the different types of pronunciation.

§ 7. Future investigations.

It should be clearly understood that all the results stated, and the theories maintained, in the following pages, are based entirely on the material which I have collected, and lay no claim to finality. Many of the conclusions which I have drawn will without doubt need to be considerably modified in various directions when further investigations are carried out. In particular, the question of the distribution of the three types of pronunciation for O.E. \ddot{y} in M.E. is far from being finally settled. The only way in which we can arrive at anything like an accurate knowledge of the history of this and other vowels, seems to be by very minute investigation of every county or small group of counties, with due regard to the precise geographical situation of every place whose name is used in illustration. Only by this means shall we be able to trace the exact course of the advance and retraction of different types of pronunciation, and finally determine the grouping of dialect features in each area at every period in the history of Middle English.

Bibliography.

A. *Monographs, etc., to which reference is made.*

- Brandl, Alois: *Zur Geographie der altenglischen Dialekte*. Abhandlungen der Königl. preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften. Jahrg. 1915. Philos.-hist. Klasse. Nr 4. Berlin, 1915.
- Dölle, Ernst: *Zur Sprache Londons vor Chaucer*. Studien zur englischen Philologie, XXXIII. Halle, 1913.
- Ekwall, Eilert: *Contributions to the History of Old English Dialects*. Lunds Universitets Årsskrift. N.F. Avd. I. Band 12. Nr 6; 1917.
- Heuser, W.: *Alt-London*. Osnabrück, 1914.
- Luick, Karl: *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache*. I-V. Leipzig, 1914, etc.
- Oman, Charles: *England before the Norman Conquest*. London, 1910.
- Pfeffer, W.: *Die Sprache des Polychronicon John Trevisas*. Düren 1912.
- Wyld, H. C.: *The Treatment of O.E. \ddot{y} in Middle English*. Englische Studien 47. p.p. 1-58, 145-166. 1913.

South-Eastern and South-East Midland Dialects. Essays and Studies VI Oxford, 1920.

The Surrey Dialect in the XIIIth century. English Studies, Vol. III Nr 2. April, 1921.

B. Sources of early forms of Place-Names.

Cal. Inq. — *Calendar of Inquisitions post Mortem preserved in the Public Record Office. 1904, etc.*

Cat. Anc. Dds. — *A Descriptive Catalogue of Ancient Deeds in the Public Record Office. (Vols. 1-6. 1890-1915).*

Earle. — *A Handbook to the Land-Charters and other Saxon Documents.* John Earle. Oxford, 1888.

F. A. — *Inquisitions and assessments relating to Feudal Aids, preserved in the Public Record Office. (Vols. 1-5. 1899, etc.)*

Forest Pleas. — *Select Pleas of the Forest.* G. J. Turner. Selden Soc. London, 1901.

H. R. — *Hundred Rolls. 2 vols.* Record Commission, 1812-1818.

Kemble. — *Codex Diplomaticus ævi saxonici.* John Kemble. 6 vols. English Historical Soc. London 1839-48.

Linc. Lib. Ant. — *Liber Antiquus de Ordinationibus Vicariarum temp. Hugonis Wells Linc. Episcopi, 1209-35.* A. Gibbons. Lincoln, 1888.

Napier. — *The Crawford Collection of early charters and documents, now in the Bodleian Library.* A. S. Napier and W. H. Stevenson. Oxford, 1895.

O. E. T. — *Oldest English Texts.* Henry Sweet. E.E.T.S. 83.

Pipe Rll. — *Publications of the Pipe Roll Society.* 1884, etc.

Select Pl. — *Select Pleas in Manorial and other Seignorial Courts.* F. W. Maitland. Selden Soc. 1889.

Sweet: 2nd Reader. — *A second Anglo-Saxon Reader.* Henry Sweet. Oxford, 1887.

2) County Records.

Bedford. Bush. Cart. — *Bushmead Cartulary. (xiv cent.)* Bedfordshire Notes and Queries III, 1893.

Berks. Abing. Obed. — *Accounts of the Obedientiars of Abingdon. (13th-15th cent.)* Cam. Soc. New Series 51. 1892.

Hurley Ch. — *St. Mary's, Hurley, in the Middle Ages: Charters and Deeds.* F. T. Wethered. London, 1898.

Cambridge. Ely Pleas. — *Pleas in the Court of the Bishop of Ely at Littleport.* F. W. Maitland: The Court Baron. Selden Soc. London 1891.

Mem. Bern. — *Liber Memorandorum ecclesie de Bernwelle (1296).* J. W. Clarke. 1907.

Devon. Reg. Brant. — *The Register of Thomas de Brantyngham, Bishop of Exeter, 1370-94.* F. C. Hingeston-Randolph: Episcopal Registers, 1901.

Reg. Bron. — *The Register of Walter de Bronescombe, Bishop of Exeter, 1251-80.* F. C. Hingeston-Randolph: Episcopal Registers, II.

Tax. Exon. — *The Taxation of Pope Nicholas IV: Exeter Diocese, 1288-91.* F. C. Hingeston-Randolph: Episcopal Registers, II.

- Dorset. Cerne Cart. — *Cartulary of Cerne Abbey*. (xiv cent.). Dorset Nat. Hist. and Antiq. Field club. XXVI, XXIX.
 Shaft. Reg. — *Shaftesbury Register* (xiv cent.). Extracts in Kemble.
- Essex. Colch. Chart. — *Cartularium Monasterii Sancti Johannis Baptiste de Colecestria*. (Contains chiefly xiii cent. documents). Stuart A. Moore. Roxburghe Club. London, 1897.
- Gloucester. Berkeley Mun. — *Catalogue of the Muniments in Berkeley Castle*. I. H. Jeayes. Bristol, 1892.
 Flax. Cart. — *Cartulary of Flaxley*. (xiii cent.). A. W. Crawley-Boevey. Exeter, 1887.
 Glos. Cart. — *Cartularium Monasterii Sancti Petri Gloucestriae*. Rolls Series 33 (xiii cent.).
 Glos. Hist. — *Historia Monasterii S. Petri Gloucestriae*. (xv cent.) Rolls Series 33. Vol. I.
- Hampshire. Codex Wint. — *Codex Wintoniensis*, a register of the Monastery of S. Peter and S. Paul at Winchester. Extracts in Kemble. (xii cent.).
 Crondal Rec. — *The Crondal Records*. F. J. Baigent. Hants. Record Soc. 1891. (13th and 14th cent.).
 Lib. de Hyda — *Liber de Hyda* (Hyde Abbey). Rolls Series 45. (xiv cent.).
- Hereford. Reg. T. de Cant. — *Register of Thomas de Cantilupe, Bishop of Hereford*, 1275-82. W. W. Capes. Cantilupe Soc. 1906.
- Hertford. Herts. Hist. — *History and Antiquities of Herts*. R. C. Clutterbuck. (Contains 13th and 14th cent. documents).
- Huntingdon. Ram. Cart. — *Cartulary of Ramsey Abbey*. (xiv cent.). Rolls Series, 79. 1884-93.
- Kent. Exc. Com. Kt. — *Excerpta de compoto solingorum comitatus cancie*. (xiii cent.). A. Ballard: An Eleventh-century Inquisition British Academy, 1920.
- Lancashire. Whal. Cou. Bk. — *The Coucher Book of Whalley Abbey* (xiv cent.). W. A. Hulton. Chetham Soc. 1847, etc.
- Leicester. Leics. Rec. — *Records of the Borough of Leicester*. M. Bateson. Cambridge, 1899.
- Norfolk. Norw. Tax. — *The Norwich Taxation of 1254*. W. Hudson. Norf. and Norwich Arch. Soc. 1908-10.
- Northampton. Lib. Nig. — *Liber Niger Monasterii S. Petri de Burgo*. (1125-1128). Cam. Soc. 47. (App.).
- Oxford. Eynsh. Cart. — *Cartulary of Eynsham*. (xii-xv cent.) H. E. Salter. Oxf. Hist. Soc. 1907-8.
 Oxf. Cart. — *Cartulary of the Monastery of St. Frideswide at Oxford*. (c. 1430-40). S. R. Wigram. Oxf. Hist. Soc., 1895.
- Shropshire. Shavington Mun. — *A catalogue of the deeds in the muniment room of Shavington Hall*. H. D. Harrod. Shrewsbury, 1891.
- Somerset. Bath Cart. C. C. C. — *Chartulary of the Priory of St. Peter at Bath* (M.S. C. C. C. CXI). W. Hunt. Somerset Rec. Soc. (xii cent.).
 Bath Cart. Linc. M.S. — *Chartulary of the Priory of St. Peter at Bath*. Lincoln's Inn M.S.; xiv and xv cent.). W. Hunt. Somerset Rec. Soc.

- Lib. H. de Sol. — *Liber Henrici de Soliaco* (1189). J. E. Jackson. Roxburghe Club, 103. 1882.
- Mon. Sec. Ind. — *Index to Abbot Monington's Secretum* (1350) F. W. Weaver.
- Stafford. Rydeware Cart. — *The Rydeware Chartulary*. I. H. Jeayes. William Salt Arch. Soc. XVI.
- Staff. For. Pl. — *Pleas of the Forest, Staffs.* (1216-1307). G. Wrottesley. William Salt Arch. Soc. Vol. V pt. I.
- Suffolk. Bury Reg. Alb. — *Album Registrum Monasterii S. Edmundi*. (Brit. Mus. Addit. 14847). xiii cent.
- Ipswich Rent. — *Two Rentals of the Priory of Ipswich* (xiii). 1847.
- Surrey. Banstead Ext. — *Extenta Manerii de Banstede, 1325*. H. C. M. Lambert: History of Banstead (Appendix). Oxford, 1912.
- Chert. Cart. — *Chartulary of Chertsey Monastery*. (Cott. Vitellius A. xiii. 13th cent.) Extracts in Kemble.
- Sussex. Bat. Cust. — *Customals of Battle Abbey* (1283-1312). S. R. Scargill-Bird. Cam. Soc. 41.
- Pev. Fees — *Knight's Fees in Pevensey* (1300). Sussex Archaeological Soc. Collections XLIII.
- S. Mary's Chart. — *Calendar of the Chartulary of St. Mary's, Chichester*. (13th cent.). Sussex Arch. Soc. Collections LI, 1908.
- Wiltshire. Malm. Reg. — *Registrum Malmesburiense*. Rolls Series, 72. (xiv cent.).
- Sar. Reg. — *Vetus registrum Sarisberiense*. Rolls Series, 78. (xiii cent.).
- Worcester. Worcs. Reg. — *Registrum Prioratus Beatæ Mariæ Wigorniensis*. (1285). Cam. Soc. 91.

§ 8.

Summary of Results.

From the material which I have collected, the following conclusions may perhaps be drawn. A discussion of each point will be found below, together with the Place-Name evidence on which the theories are based.

I: The Fracture of α before $l +$ cons.

a) The fracture of $\tilde{\alpha}$ before $l +$ cons. is a characteristic feature of the Saxon dialects in O.E., but there seem to have been two independent areas of development, one in the east, and one in the west.

b) Fracture did not, apparently, take place in Early Kentish, but the fracture-forms which appear in 9th and 10th century Kentish seem to have been introduced from a neighbouring dialect.

c) Absence of fracture appears also in a certain part of the W. S. territory (Dorset).

d) Of the counties that were within the fracture-area in the O.E. period, Suffolk, Bucks. and Beds. appear to have been the first to abandon the fracture-type, then the South-West (Devon and Somerset), and then the South-eastern counties. The fracture type seems to remain longest in Essex, Hants., and Dorset.

II: i -mutation of $\bar{e}\bar{a}$.

a) O.E. $\bar{i}\bar{e}$ for the i -mutation of $\bar{e}\bar{a}$ is found in the counties south of the

Thames and the Bristol Channel, excluding Kent, Surrey, and Sussex; it is found also, alongside of the \bar{e} -type, in Gloucester and Middlesex.

b) In the M.E. period, the \bar{ie} -type appears in Hants., Dorset, Devon, Somerset, Wilts., and to some extent in Glos. and Middlesex.

c) It is possible that the \bar{i} -type originated in Berkshire.

III: M.E. [y], [ø] for O.E. \check{eo} .

a) O.E. \check{eo} becomes M.E. [y] or [ø] (written *u*, *ue*, *o*, *eo*, *oe*), in all the South-western counties; in parts of Surrey and Bucks.; in Oxford, Glos., Hereford, West Worcs.; in South-east Shropshire, and also in Lancashire.

IV: O.E. \check{y} (= \check{u} - i) in M.E.

a) O.E. \check{y} is generally so written until the end of the O.E. period in all districts except Kent and Suffolk, where it appears as *e*. It is natural to suppose that O.E. \check{y} became *e* in Essex also, though I have found no evidence for this in O.E. documents. Isolative unrounding had already begun in the 10th and 11th centuries in Devon, and in Herts. and Oxford.

b) O.E. \check{y} seems to have been unrounded before a front cons. in the following counties: Devon, Dorset, Wilts., Hants., Berks., and part of Somerset.

c) O.E. \check{y} appears as *u* in M.E. all over the west and central midlands and in the south-west.

d) In the South-West, the *i*-type is very common in M.E., and spreads eastwards during the 13th and 14th centuries into Dorset, Hants., and Wilts.

e) In early M.E., *i* is found, together with *u*, in the South Midlands, Oxf., Bucks., Beds., Herts., and also in Middlesex, which retains it as the predominating type.

f) By the 14th century, the *u*-area seems to have extended considerably further to the east. In the following century the London *i*-type is found in the spelling of Pl. Ns. nearly all over the country, though it can hardly have penetrated into the pronunciation of the local dialects.

g) In the 13th century the *e*-type predominates in Kent, Essex, and Suffolk. It is fairly common in Sussex, Cambridge and Herts.; and there are traces of it in Surrey, Bucks., and even Norfolk. By the 14th century, *e* seems to have been used more frequently in Sussex and Norfolk, and *e*-forms appear also in Northants., Beds., and Lincoln. The \check{e} -type seems to be fairly widespread also in Middlesex (Heuser: *Alt-London*).

Section I.

The Fracture of \check{a} before *l* + consonant.

§ 9. The Beginning of Fracture.

It is generally assumed that the fracture of \check{a} before *l* + cons. took place in Saxon and Kentish (see Bülbring: § 134; Sievers, *Ags. Gram*: § § 80, 158); Schlemilch limits it to the South-Eastern dialects (*Zur Spr. und Orthog. der spätae. Denkmäler*, p. 27). Ekwall (*Contrib. to the Hist. of O.E. dial.*, p. 38) comes to the conclusion that 'Breaking of *a* before *l* + cons. is a universal feature of the Saxon and Kentish dialects'. There are, however, grounds for believing that the process was essentially Saxon; that the

fracture-forms in Kentish were not original, but were introduced from a neighbouring dialect; and that a part of the W. Saxon area (Dorset) used *al* + cons. beside the usual *eal* even as late as the 9th century.

Since the fracture-diphthong had developed before the period of *i*-mutation, which according to Bülbring (Elem. § 158) was in the 6th and early 7th centuries, the process must have been completed by the beginning of the 6th century. The tendency to diphthongise *æ* before *l* + cons. seems to have been especially characteristic of the West and the East Saxons. In Kent and Surrey on the other hand the earliest charters have no fracture-forms (§§ 27; 28); Surrey, it may be well to point out, was perhaps originally under the dominion of Kent, and was conquered by the West Saxons towards the end of the 6th century (Brandl: *Geogr.* § 6) — after the fracture-period. In the absence of Sussex documents earlier than the 11th century it is impossible to say definitely whether the South Saxons shared with the Saxon invaders of the east and west the particular dialect feature in question; that they did do so seems probable from the fact that the 11th century Sussex charter (Kemble: 732) has only *eal*-forms; this charter appears to be written in a genuine dialect.

The two fracture-areas correspond roughly to the two kingdoms of Essex and Wessex. The western area includes all the south-western counties south of the Thames and the Bristol Channel with the exception of Dorset. Gloucester, Worcester and Warwick undoubtedly lie outside the *eal*-area (§ 17). The border district of Oxford shows traces of *al*-forms. Essex (§ 22) is almost certainly an *eal*-county; the later East Saxon conquests (E. Herts. and Middlesex) have a few *al*-forms. The early Suffolk charters have only *eal*-forms.

The following paragraphs show, as far as my material permits, the details of the history of *æ* before *l* + cons. in each of the southern and midland counties up to the tenth century.

N.B. The figures in brackets after each Pl. N. element indicate the number of times that element (or independent word) occurs in the document referred to.

§ 10. The South-western Group.

The earliest Fracture-forms occur in a Wiltshire charter of 778 (Cott. Chart. VIII 4. O.E.T. 3) which writes *ealh*, *healh*. In the ninth century my material shows 18 *eal*-forms for Hants. and no *al*; while in the tenth century Devon (§ 13), Somerset (§ 14), Wilts. (§ 11), Hants. (§ 12), and Berks. (§ 15) have respectively 21, 2, 26, 8 and 5 *eal*-forms and no *al*, with the single exception of Berks., which has a small proportion of unfractured forms, easily accounted for by the fact that it lies next to Oxfordshire. For Dorset in the 9th century I have noted 5 *al*-forms to 3 *eal*. The dialect of the charter concerned (Cott. chart. VIII 36) seems perfectly genuine. It can hardly be doubted that we have here a small area in the W. Saxon territory in which the *al*-type existed beside the usual Saxon *eal*. The entire absence of unfractured forms in the other W.S. counties is striking, and makes it more probable that the *al*-forms, wherever they occur, are genuine, and not borrowed from an Anglian dialect.

§ 11. Wiltshire. 8th cent. O.E.T. ch. 3 (778): *healh* (2). 10th cent. Kemble 328 (after 900): *eall* (4); *healf*; *seald-* (5); *heald-*. Kemble 353 (931): *eall*; *eald*; *Ealh-* (2). Kemble 378 (939): *sealt-* (2). Birch 748 (940): *Ealh-* (1). Kemble 1290 (995): *eall* (3); *healf* (2); *cealf*; *eald*; *healdan*.

§ 12. Hampshire. 9th cent. Kemble 272 (854): *ealdor*-. Kemble 314 (880-885): *eall* (6); *healf*; *seald*- (4); *eald* (2): *ealdor* (3).

10th cent. Birch 596 (901): *eald*-; *cealc* (2). Kemble 553 (967): *eald*- (4). Kemble 535 (967): *cealf*-.

§ 13. Devon. 10th cent. Napier IV (930): *ceald*- (2). Kemble 369 (937): *eald*. Kemble 371 (938): *eald*- (2). Kemble 373 (938): *eald* (2). Birch 723 (938): *eald* (2). Birch 724 (938): *eald* (2). Birch 1103 (963): *healf*; *eald*- (6). Napier II: *eald*; *weald*- (2).

§ 14. Somerset. 10th cent. Birch 903 (955): *eald*; *mealm*-

§ 15. Berkshire. 10th cent. Kemble 427 (949): *eald*; *-bald*. Birch 892 (951): *eald*-; *sealh*-. Birch 935 (956): *eald*-; *cealc*-; *-fald*.

§ 16. Dorset. 9th cent. Kemble 260 (847): *weal*-; *dealf*; *heald*-; *Alh*- (2); *-bald*; *ald*-; *wald*-.

§ 17. The South-West Midlands.

In the 8th and 9th centuries Gloucester (§ 18) and Worcester (§ 19) have only *al*-forms. I have no eighth century material for Hereford or Warwick, but the 9th century charters relating to these counties have only unfractured forms (§§ 20, 21). In the 10th century, however, (very little material except for Worcs.) I have found only *eal*-forms for Glos., Heref., and Warwick; in Worcs. both the types appear fairly frequently. This may be a genuine case of the spread of one type at the cost of another, or the *eal*-forms may be due to the influence of W. S. scribal forms. In view of later developments the latter alternative is the more probable.

§ 18. Gloucester. 8th cent. O.E.T. ch. 14 (779): *Ald*-; *-bald*; *-wald*. O.E.T. ch. 15 (791-6): *Alh*- (3); *-walh*. 9th cent. Kemble 243 (c. 840): *all*; *sald*- (2); *Bald*-; *Alch*-; *Ald*- (4).

10th cent. Kemble 426 (949): *eald*; *sealt*- (2). Kemble 692 (995): *ealdor*-.

§ 19. Worcester. 8th cent. O.E.T. ch. 9 (736): *-bald* (5). O.E.T. ch. 10 (759): *Ald*- (2); *-wald*. O.E.T. ch. 13 (770): *halh*; *-bald* (2).

9th cent. Kemble 237 (836): *sald*-; *aldor*- (2); *-hale* (2). Birch 490 (855): *Alh*-. Kemble 305 (c. 872): *all* (3); *Alh*- (2); *ald*-; *sald*-. Birch 513: *ald*- (2); *calc*.

10th cent. Sweet, 2nd Reader, ch. 31 (904): *all*. Birch 1233 (969): *eall* (2); *heald*-; *wal*. Kemble 570 (972): *eald*- (11); *sealt*- (4); *healt* (2); *cealc* (2); *cald*- (3); *bald*- (4); *-fald* (2); *-wald*; *calf*-; *salt*- (2); *halh* (2). Sweet, 2nd Reader ch. 34 (984): *half*; *cald*- (2).

§ 20. Hereford. 9th cent. Earle, *Land Chart*. p. 119 (840): *Ald*-

10th cent. Birch 1040 (958): *Ealh*- (2)

§ 21. Warwick. 9th cent. Birch 560 (889): *all*- (2); *Alh*- (2); *ald*-; *sald*-.

10th cent. Napier VIII (988): *eal*-; *healf*; *sealt*-; *ealdor*-.

§ 22. The Eastern Fracture-area.

Already in the 10th century Cambridge (§ 23), Suffolk (§ 24), and Essex (§ 25) have nothing but *eal*-forms. Unfortunately there are no earlier charters for this region except one from Essex (Barking, c. 692), which contains the personal names *egcbaldus*, *ercnuwaldus*; but as the elements *bald* and *wald* in unstressed syllables of personal names never afford very satisfactory evidence, this does not give much help. If this were originally a non-fracture area one would expect to find traces of *al*-forms (as one does in Worcs.) among the *eal*-forms, which are fairly numerous in the material for these three counties: the W. S. influence on the S. E. midland dialect can hardly have been strong enough at this time to oust the *al*-type completely. The fracture-forms must then be indigenous to this area, and though, as will

be seen, the Cambridge and Suffolk *eal*-forms soon disappeared before the encroachments of the northern *al*, Essex keeps a large proportion of *eal*-forms right into the 15th century.

§ 23. Cambridge. 10th cent. Kemble 563 (970): *eald*; *sealde*; *ealdor* (2); *healde*; *wealde* (2); *eall*- (11). Birch 1305 (974): *healh* (2). Birch 1306 (after 974): *eall* (2); *weal*-; *healf* (10); *sealde*; *wealde*; *gehealde*; *ealdor*-.

§ 24. Suffolk. 10th cent. Sweet 2nd Reader ch. 45 (after 991); *æal*- (6); *healf* (1); *sæalde*; *eald*- (2); *æaldor*- (9); *Weald*- (2).

§ 25. Essex. 7th cent. O.E.T. ch. 1 (692 or 693): *-uuald*; *-bald*. 10th cent. Kemble 699 (697): *eall* (2); *healf* (3). Kemble 704 (c. 999): *eall*- (3); *ealdor*-.

§ 26. Kent and Surrey.

The 8th century Kentish charters have no fracture-forms (§ 27); in the 7th century there are two unfractured and no fractured forms. The 9th century Surrey charter (§ 28) has only *al*-forms, while in the Kt. charters of this century the proportion of *al* to *eal* is 60: 50. In the 10th century Surrey has, according to my material, 2 *eal*-forms and no *al*, Kent 22 *eal* to 3 *al*. There can be no doubt that these counties were untouched by the fracture tendency in the 5th and 6th centuries. It is true that the 7th and 8th century charters are few in number, but the evidence they afford all points in the same direction, and suggests what is perhaps a simpler explanation of the numerous *al*-forms in the 9th century than the usual theory that they are due to Mercian influence. A few unfractured forms occur also, as we have seen, in Dorset charters of the 9th and 11th centuries. If these *al*-forms were really Mercian, we should expect to find them scattered over all the southern counties, not limited to two well-defined areas, Dorset in the west, Kent and Surrey in the east.

The problem that now arises is, where do the fracture-forms come from in the 9th and 10th centuries? The new type might have come in through Surrey from Hants., but then Surrey would show fracture earlier than Kent, whereas the reverse is the case. If Sussex was indeed on *eal*-area, its influence may have effected the change; but unfortunately we know nothing about this county before the eleventh century. There remains only Essex. Since this dialect had so many features in common with Kentish in the O.E. and M.E. periods (see Wyld: *Essays and Studies* VI, 1920 p. 143), it is natural to suppose that the *eal*-forms spread southwards across the Thames estuary, first into Kent, and thence into Surrey.

§ 27. Kent: 7th cent. O.E.T. ch. 4 (679): *ald*-; *-uuald*.

8th cent. O.E.T. ch. 5 (700-715): *-uuald* (2); O.E.T. ch. 7 (770): *ald*-; *-uualh* (2).

9th cent. O.E.T. ch. 33 (803): *ealh*-; *alh*- (2); *ald*-; *-bald* (2). O.E.T. ch. 34 (805): *eald*-; *halfe*; *alre*; *alh*- (2); *ald*-; *-wald*. Kemble 191 (805-31); *alre*; *halfe*. Kemble 226 (805-31): *all*- (2); *saldon*; *aldor*-. Kemble 204 (814): *healh*; *healfe*. O.E.T. ch. 35 (811): *ealh*-; *ald*- (2). O.E.T. ch. 38 (831): *weald*-; *-beald*; *ealh*-; *-wald* (3). Kemble 228 (831): *salde*; *aldor*-; *-wald* (4). Kemble 229 (831): *Ealh*- (5); *mealt*; *eall* (2); *-weald* (3); *Eald*- (2); *eald*; *heald*- (2). Kemble 231 (832): *heald*- (3); *seald* (2); *malt*. Kemble 235 (835): *cealf*; *Alch*- (2); *half*; *maltes*; *saltes*; *ald*; *haldan* (3). Kemble 238 (837): *all* (2). Kemble 281 (858): *healf*; *sealt*- (4); *sealde* (2). Kemble 282 (859): *healf*- (4); *halfne*. Kemble 285 (860-862): *healf* (2); *eald*; *-half* (5). Kemble 287 (862): *halfa*; *utwalda*. O.E.T. ch. 44 (866-888): *sealde*; *-weald* (4).

Codex Aureus Inscr. (c. 850) O.E.T. p. 174: *all-* (2); *Alh-* (2); *aldor-*. Lonic Prayer: O.E.T. p. 181: *all-* (5). 10th cent. Bede Glosses, O.E.T. p. 181: *fallendum*; *alder-*. Birch 562: *healf*; *-steall*; *eald* (2). Kemble 377 (939): *wealda*; *Ealh-*; *-wald*. Kemble 499 (960-3): *eall-* (7); *feall-*; *sealde* (2); *healdan*; Kemble 477 (958): *eall* (2); *sealde*. Kemble 657 (987): *-healfe*; *wealda*.

§ 28. Surrey. 9th cent. Kemble 317 (871-889): *all-* (4); *halfe*; *hald-* (3). 10th cent. Birch 1198 (967): *cealua-* (2).

§ 29. The Central Midlands.

Middlesex (§ 30), Oxf. (§ 31), Bucks. (§ 32) and Beds. (§ 33) have fracture-forms in the 10th century. I have too little material to make a definite statement about this area, but as Herts. (§ 34) has 1 *al* and no *eal*, and Oxf. has 2 *al* to 10 *eal*, while an 8th century Midd. charter has 2 *al* and no *eal*, perhaps *al* was the original type, the *eal-* forms introduced from Wessex (or in the case of Middlesex from Essex).

§ 30. Middlesex. 8th cent. O.E.T. ch. 2 (693-731): *uald-*; *-uald*. 10th cent. Birch 1048 (959): *eald* (2). Birch 1063 (960-2): *eall-* (3); *-weald*; *ealdor-* (5); *sealde-* (5). Birch: 1085 (962): *-steall*.

§ 31. Oxford. 10th cent. Kemble 453 (956): *eald* (3); *-bald* (2). Birch 945 (956): *healh-*. Birch 1176 (966): *eald-* (2); *cealf-* (2). Kemble 691 (995): *ealdan* (2).

§ 32. Bucks. 10th cent. Birch 603 (903): *eald*; *wealdan*.

§ 33. Beds. 10th cent. Birch 1229 (969): *eall*; *healh*; *ealdan* (5).

§ 34. Herts. 10th century. Birch 994 (957): *-stall*.

§ 35. The eleventh century.

There are so many gaps in the material for this period, that one can only say that the *eal*-forms seem to have gained ground considerably. Even Worcs. (§ 39) has 73 *eal* to 36 *al*, and Kent (§ 44) 14 *eal* and no *al*. In nearly all the charters I have examined the W.S. influence is unmistakable; genuine dialect forms are hard to find, and it is quite probable that the apparent spread of the *eal*-forms is misleading. It is remarkable that Dorset (§ 37) still retains a few *al*-forms. Suffolk (§ 42) already shows the influence of the Anglian type (3 *al* to 7 *eal*).

§ 36. Devon: Napier X (1008-1012): *eall-* (2); *gehealdon*. Kemble 744 (1031): *healfan*. Earle (11th cent. charters): *Eald-*; *cealfa-* (2); *healfe* (2); *helf*; *sealt-*.

§ 37. Dorset. Kemble 741 (1024): *eald* (3); *-steall*; *wale* (2). Kemble 942: *healle*; *eall-* (2); *heald-*; *-weald*.

§ 38. Somerset. Earle (11th cent. ch.): *healfan* (2).

§ 39. Worcester. Kemble 724 (1016): *healf*; *sealt-*. Kemble 738 (1023): *sealde*; *ealdor-*. Kemble 764 (1042): *eald-* (3); *salt-* (2); *calc-* (2). Kemble 765 (1042): *eald-* (3); *sealt*. Kemble 923 (1049-58): *weall-*; *heald-* (2); *wealde*. Kemble 804 (1049-58): *eall-* (2); *healf* (2); *wealde*. M.S. Tiberius A. xiii (Extracts in Kemble): *sealt-* (2); *eald-* (18); *eall-* (16); *seald-* (7); *Ealdor-*; *heald-* (3); *-stealle*; *weal-*; *ald-* (6); *all-* (6); *hald-* (3); *half-*; *alder-*; *salt-* (9); *wall-* (2); *-halh*; *cald-* (2).

§ 40. Hereford. Kemble 755 (before 1038): *eall-* (4); *ealdor* (2). Kemble 882 (before 1056): *healf* (2); *ealra*.

§ 41. Warwick. Kemble 705 (1001): *healf*; *ealdan*. Kemble 924: *half*.

§ 42. Suffolk. Kemble 874: *eall-* (3); *healf*; *-steall*. Kemble 875: *ealle* (2); *al-* (3).

§ 43. Essex. Kemble 788 (1049): *ealle*.

§ 44. Kent. Kemble 773 (1044): *eall-*; *steall-*. Kemble 737 (1023): *eal-* (4); *healue* (2); *-weald*; *-heald*; *ealder-*. Kemble 789 (1038-50): *eall-* (2); *sealde*.

§ 45. Sussex. Kemble 732 (1016-20): *eall-* (3); *healf*; *ealdan*.

§ 46. Middlesex. Kemble: 843: *eall-* (4); *cealc-*; *ealswā*. Kemble 886: *eall* (2); *heald-*; *alle*. Earle (11th cent. ch.): *eald-*; *heald-*; *steal-* (2).

§ 47. Oxford. Kemble 714 (1005): *eall-* (2); *eald* (4); *healdaþ*; *ealdor*; *healf-* (2).

§ 48. Herts. Kemble 1352: *healfre*; *sealde*. Kemble 1354: *Eald-*.

§ 49. From the 12th to the 15th century.

During these four hundred years the fracture-forms disappear gradually. The following outline of the development in each area is based entirely on the material which I have collected. The unlengthened forms (O.E. *cealf*, *cealc*, etc.) and the lengthened forms (O.E. *ceald*, *eald*) are discussed separately, as in many districts the *chalf-*, *chalk-* forms are retained long after the *chald-*, *eld-* forms have disappeared.

§ 50. O.E. *ald* in M.E.

In the south-western group of counties, Somerset (§ 52) has both *al* and *eal* forms in the 12th and 13th centuries, only *al* in the 14th. Devon (§ 53) is an *eal*-county in the 13th century, but after this only *al*-forms are found. Wilts (§ 54) and Dorset (§ 55) retain their fracture-forms right into the 15th century; during the whole period Wilts. has rather more *al* than *eal*-forms, Dorset more *eal* than *al*. In the south-west midlands, Gloucester (§ 56), Hereford (§ 57) Worcs. (§ 58), and Warwick (§ 59) have only *al*-forms. The same is true of the east-midland counties Leics. (§ 60), Rutland (§ 61), Northants. (§ 62), Hunts. (§ 63), Cambridge (§ 64), Norfolk (§ 65), and Suffolk (§ 66). In the S.E. group, Essex (§ 67) has many more *eal* than *al*-forms in the 13th century, and keeps these forms, though in a smaller proportion, in the 14th and 15th centuries. Herts. (§ 68), Midd. (§ 69), Surrey (§ 70) and Sussex (§ 71) are practically *al*-counties, though traces of *eal*-forms occur. In Kent (§ 72) both types seem to have been used until the 15th century when the *eal*-type disappears. Hants. (§ 73) is an *eal* county in the 12th and 13th centuries; it has more *al* than *eal*-forms in the 14th and 15th centuries. Berks. (§ 74) seems to be an *al*-county; its position between Hants. and Oxf. makes this rather doubtful, and traces of *eal*-forms appear in the 15th century. Bucks. (§ 75) has nothing but *al* except for a few *eal*-forms in the 14th century. Beds. (§ 76) has only *al*. Oxford (§ 77) has rather more *eal* than *al*-forms in the 12th and 13th centuries, more *al* than *eal* in the 14th and only *al* in the 15th.

Ekwall (*Contrib. to the Hist. of O.E. Dial.*) examined M.E. Place-names chiefly in order to determine the boundary of the area of fracture (of *æ* before *l* + cons.) in O.E. That such a method is not entirely successful is evident from the following facts. Ekwall includes Kent in the fracture-area (p. 32); this is certainly true in M.E., but in early Kentish there is no fracture (§ 26). Suffolk, in spite of the evidence of the M.E. forms (Ekwall, p. 32) was within the fracture-area in O.E. (§ 22). The rare M.E. examples of *eld* in

Glos. are not enough to prove fracture for the O.E. period: the early charters give entirely contradictory evidence (§ 18); this is also true with regard to Worcester.

§ 51. O.E. *-alf*, *-alk*.

Somerset is the only county that keeps the fracture-forms longer before *-ld* than before *-lf* (§ 52). Even in the 12th century Somerset has *calf-*, *calv-*, and these are the only forms throughout the period. Devon (§ 53), Dorset (§ 55) and Wilts. (§ 54) have only fracture-forms. The following counties all have *calf-*, etc.: Hereford, Glos., Worcs., Warwick, Leics., Rutland, Northants., Hunts., Norfolk. The only illustrative example I have found for Cambridge is a 12th century *Chaluelea* (§ 64). Suffolk (§ 66) has only *eal*-forms in the 12th and 13th centuries; I have no later examples of either type. Essex (§ 67) seems to have only *eal*. Herts. (§ 68) is doubtful: the 13th century material shows only one example of each type. The following counties have only *eal*: Middlesex, Surrey, Sussex, Kent, Hants., Berks., Bedford. Oxford (§ 77) and Bucks. (§ 75) have usually *eal*, but *al* occurs occasionally.

§ 52. Somerset. 12th cent. Bath Cart. C.C.C.C. *Ald-* (1); *Calv-* (3). Lib. H. de S. *calv-* (1); *-wold* (1); *elde-* (2).

13th cent. Bath Cart. Linc. M.S. *Olde-* (1); *Calv-* (2); *Cheld-* (2). F.A. IV (1284-5): *-wolde*; *Chelde-*.

14th cent. Bath Cart. Linc. M.S. *Olde-* (2); *Cold-* (13); *Celde-* (1). F.A. IV (1303-46): *Ald-* (5); *Wald-* (1); *Folde* (1); *Calv-* (5). *Welde* (1).

Mon. Sec. Ind. *Ald-* (1); *Chalk-* (1).

15th cent. F.A. IV (1428): *Calv-* (1).

§ 53. Devon. 12th cent. *Cald-* (1). Pipe Rll. (1168).

13th cent. F.A. I (1284-6): *Beald-* (1). Cotton Roll II *sealde* (1).

14th cent. F.A. I (1316-46) *Old-* (3); *Wald-* (4); *Chalv-* (2); Leigh Reg. *Halde-* (1); *-wold* (6).

15th cent. F.A. I (1428): *Old-* (1); *Cold-* (1); *Fold-* (2); *Wold-* (3); *Chalv-* (1).

§ 54. Wiltshire. 12th cent. Pipe Rll. (1167-95): *Ald-* (7); *Cald-* (1); *Cheld-* (3); *Chelk-* (3).

13th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Elde-* (1); *Chelke* (1).

14th cent. Reg. Malm. *Olde-* (8); *Cald-* (9); *Chald-* (1). F.A. V *Ald-* (3); *Chald-* (1). Cat. Anc. Dds. *Ald-* (2); *Cald-* (1); *Elde-* (1); *Welde* (1).

15th cent. F.A. V (1428): *Ald-* (8); *Chald-* (4). Cat. Anc. Dds. *Olde-* (2); *Colde-* (1); *Wald-* (1); *Chalde-* (1).

The Wiltshire poem, *St. Editha* (c. 1420), has only unfractured forms: *olde*, *bolde*, *colde*, *folde*, *told*, *ytolde*, *holde*, *byholde*, etc.

§ 55. Dorset. 13th cent. F.A. II (1285): *Ald-* (1); *Wald-* (1); *Chald-* (1); *Chalv-* (3). H.R. I (1275): *Chalv-* (1).

14th cent. F.A. II (1316-46): *Chald-* (1); *chalv-* (3). Shaft. Reg.: *ald-* (5); *-wold* (2); *falde* (1); *eald-* (32); *chald-* (1); *Chealc-* (1); *chelf-* (3). Cat. Anc. Dds. *-wald* (1).

15th cent. F.A. II *Chalde-* (3); *Chalv-* (3).

§ 56. Gloucester. 12th cent. Pipe Rll. (1176-7): *Alde-* (2).

13th cent. Cart. Flax. *Ald-* (8). Gloucs. Cart. *Ald-* (72); *Wolde* (1); *Calv-* (8); *Elde-* (1).

14th cent. *Kalv-* (1) Cat. Anc. Dds. (1310).

15th cent. *Old-* (13) Cat. Anc. Dds.

Robert of Gloucester (M.S. Cott. Calig. A. XI c. 1320-30) has only unfractured forms: *al*, *alle*, *ivalle*, *tolde*, *iholde*, *olde*, *bolde*, *monyvoide*, etc.

§ 57. Hereford. 13th cent. Reg. T. de C.: *Ald-* (3); *Fald* (1).

14th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Ald-* (3); *Kald* (2).

15th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds.: *Old-* (1); *Cald-* (1). F. A. II (1428): *Old-* (3); *Cald-* (3).

§ 58. Worcester. 12th cent. Pipe Rll. (1169): *Ald-* (1).

13th cent. Worcs. Reg. *Ald-* (1); *Wolde* (1); *Calv-* (3). Cat. Anc. Dds. *Old-* (3); *Cald-* (1).

14th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Ald-* (7); *Cald-* (6).

15th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Old-* (1) (1480).

§ 59. Warwick. 12th cent. Pipe Rll. (1195): *Chalf-* (1).

13th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Old-* (2); *Cald-* (1); *Calv-* (1).

14th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Holde-* (1); *Cald-* (14). F. A. V (1316): *Old-* (1); *Cald-* (1); *-wold* (4).

15th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Olde* (1); *Wald-* (9). F. A. V (1428): *Cald-* (1).

§ 60. Leicester. 12th cent. Pipe Rll. *Cald-* (4); *Wald-* (1); *Chelv-* (1).

15th cent. F. A. III (1428) *Cold-* (1); *-wold* (7).

§ 61. Rutland. 12th cent. *Calk-* (1) Pipe Rll. (1189-99).

14th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Ald-* (1). F. A. IV (1316): *Cald-* (2).

§ 62. Northants. 12th cent. Lib. Nig. *Ald-* (2). Pipe Rll. (1167-99): *Ald-* (2); *Cold-* (1); *Wald-* (2).

13th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Ald-* (7). F. A. IV (1284): *Ald-* (2); *Wald* (5); *Chelv-* (3).

14th cent. F. A. IV (1316-46): *Ald-* (4); *Cold-* (1); *Wald-* (3).

15th cent. F. A. IV (1428): *Ald-* (6); *Cold-* (1); *Wald-* (8).

The 12th century *Peterborough Chronicle* (M.S. Laud) has usually unfractured forms: *halden*, *alre*, *half*, *ald*, etc., but sometimes *eald*, *wealde*, *healfe*, *sælde*, etc.

§ 63. Huntingdon. 12th cent. Pipe Rll.: *Cald-* (1); *Wald-* (1).

13th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Wold-* (6).

14th cent. Ram. Cart. *Ald-* (10); *Wold-* (38); *Cold-* (23); *-talde*: (7); *Calv-* (7). *Elde-* (3); *Welde* (1); *-tealde* (1).

§ 64. Cambridge. 12th cent. Pipe Rll. *Chalv-* (1).

13th cent. F. A. I (1284-6): *Cold-* (1). Mem. Bern. *Cald-* (31); *Wald-* (3); *Ald-* (3); *Weld-* (1).

14th cent. F. A. I (1302-46): *Cald-* (11); *Wald-* (2).

15th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. (1457): *Old-* (1).

§ 65. Norfolk. 12th cent. Pipe Rll. *Ald-* (1); *Cald-* (1); *Calv-* (2).

13th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Old-* (2).

14th cent. F. A. III (1302-46): *Ald-* (8); *Wald-* (19); *Calv-* (3); *Calc-* (2).

15th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Cald-* (2); *Calk-* (1); *Chalf-* (1). F. A. III: *Old-* (6); *Cald-* (1); *-wold* (8).

Genesis and Exodus, the Bestiary, and the Norfolk Gilds, all have *-ald*, *-old*, etc.

§ 66. Suffolk. 12th cent. Pipe Rlls. *Ald-* (10); *Wald-* (1). *Cheld-* (1); *Chalv-* (13).

13th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Ald-* (2); *Cald-* (2).

14th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Ald-* (6); *Cold-* (1); *Wald-* (1). F. A. V (1302-46): *Ald-* (15); *Cald-* (5); *Wald-* (18).

15th cent. F. A. V (1401-2): *Olde-* (1); *Calde-* (1). Cat. Anc. Dds. *Old-* (7).

§ 67. Essex. 12th cent. Pipe Rll. *Ald-* (2); *Calv-* (1); *Chalv-* (17)

13th cent. The Colchester Chartulary has only *-eld* forms (Heuser: *Alt-London*, p. 35).

14th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Ald-* (4); *Weld-* (2); *Chald-* (1); F.A. II: *Wald* (2); *Welde* (6).

15th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Old-* (2); *Calv-* (1); *-weld* (2). F.A. II *Ald-* (1); *Chald-* (2); *Weld-* (4).

§ 68. Herts. 12th cent. Pipe Rll. *Ald-* (5).

13th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Ald-* (5); *Wald-* (1); *Eald-* (1). H.R. I *Cald-* (1).

14th cent. F.A. II (1303): *Ald-* (4); *Cald-* (1); *Chald-* (2). Cat. Anc. Dds. *Ald-* (12).

15th cent. F.A. II: *Ald-* (3); *Cald-* (3).

§ 69. Middlesex. 12th cent. Pipe Rll. *Ald-* (1); *Chal-* (2). Cat. Anc. Dds. *Ald-* (5).

13th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Ald-* (21); *Elde-* (1).

14th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Ald-* (19); *Cold-* (3); *Elde* (1).

15th cent. F.A. III (1428): *Ald-* (6); *Cold-* (1).

§ 70. Surrey. 12th cent. Pipe Rll. *Chald-* (1); *Chalv-* (1).

13th cent. Chert. Cart. *all-* (13); *Ald-* (2); *half* (2); — *eald-* (2); *eall-* (3); *Chalv-* (3); *helden* (1).

14th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Ald-* (1); *-wald* (2); *Chalf-* (1). F.A. V. *Ald-* (1).

15th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Cold-* (1); — *chalv-* (1). F.A. V (1428): *Ald-* (1); *Wald-* (2); *-fold* (3); — *Chald-* (1); *Chalv-* (2).

§ 71. Sussex. 12th cent. Pipe Rll. *Ald-* (1); *Wald-* (1).

13th cent. F.A. V *Ald-* (6); Bat. Cust. *Ald-* (1); *Cald-* (1). S. Mary's chart. *Ald-* (3); *Cold-* (1).

14th cent. F.A. V. *Ald-* (7); *Wald-* (1); *Chalv-* (3). Pev. Fees. *Ald-* (3); *Chalv-* (2).

15th cent. F.A. V *Ald-* (3); *Chalv-* (2). (From a M.S. in the Brit. Mus.) *ald-* (8); *-fold* (1); *Bald-* (5); *eald* (2).

§ 72. Kent. 12th cent. Pipe Rll. *Ald-* (9); *Cald-* (1); *Chalv-* (1); *Chalc-* (1). Text. Roff. *ald-* (2); *wald-* (2); *sald-* (1); — *Weald-* (2); *healf-* (2), *Cealc-* (1).

13th cent. F.A. III *Ald-* (4); *Weld-* (2); *Chelk-* (4).

14th cent. F.A. III *Ald-* (6); *Cald-* (3); *Wald-* (5). *Eald-* (10); *weald-* (1); *Chalk-* (2).

15th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Ald-* (2); *Cald-* (2); *Chalk-* (1).

§ 73. Hampshire. 12th cent. Codex. Wint. *eald-* (30); *seald-* (8); *weald-* (2).

13th century. Crondal Rec. *Cheld-* (11).

14th cent. Lib. de Hyda *Old-* (4); *Chalc-* (4). Cat. Anc. Dds. *Ald* (2); *Eld-* (1); *Chalf-* (1).

The 13th century *Poema Morale* (M.S. Egerton 613) (which is said to have been written in Hants.) agrees with the Pl. Ns. in having only fracture-forms: *eald*, *healden*, *helde*, *bihelde*, *-felde*, etc.

The 14th century *Usages of Winchester* (E.E.T.S. 50) has usually *ald*, *old* (*halde*, *haldeth*, *y-holde*, *y-sold*, etc.), but there are two examples of *eld* (*y-helde*, *y-seld*).

§ 74. Berks. 12th cent. Pipe Rll. *Ald-* (2).

13th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Chald-* (2); H.R. *Ald-* (1); *Chalf-* (5).

14th cent. F.A.I. *Ald-* (2); Abing. Obed. *Old-* (1); *Cald-* (3).

15th cent. F.A. I *Ald-* (1); *Cald-* (2). Abing. Obed. *Ald-* (1); *Cald-* (2). Cat. Anc. Dds. *Eld-* (2).

§ 75. Bucks. 12th cent. Pipe Rll. *Ald-* (1); *Wald-* (1). *Chalf-* (7).

- 13th cent. F.A. I *Cald-* (1); *Wald-* (1). H.R. I *Cald-* (8); *Calv-* (5); *Chalv-* (6).
 14th cent. F.A. I *Cald-* (9); *Chalf-* (1).
 § 76. Beds. 12th cent. Pipe Rll. *Cald-* (1); *Calv-* (1); *Chalv-* (5).
 13th cent. H.R. I *Cald-* (4); *Chal-* (3).
 14th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Bald-* (1); *Cald-* (9); *Chal-* (4). Bushmead
 Cartulary *Chalf-* (2).
 15th cent. F.A. I *Cald-* (1); *Fald-* (2); *Chal-* (2).
 § 77. Oxford. 12th Eynsh. Cart. -*wald* (4); *Weald* (7).
 13th cent. Eynsh. Cart. *Ald-* (2); *Cald-* (2); *Bald-* (5); *Walde* (1); *Calv-*
 (2). *Eld-* (2); *Chald-* (1); *Welde* (11); *Chalf-* (2).
 14th cent. Eynsh. Cart. *Bald-* (1); *Calv-* (2); *Weld-* (3). F.A. IV *Ald-* (2);
Cold- (3); -*wold* (2); *Chalk-* (2); -*weld* (1).
 15th cent. Cart. St. Frid. *Old-* (5); *Cold-* (1).
 [To be continued]
 Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford.

MARY S. SERJEANTSON.

Notes and News.

A Holiday at Stratford-on-Avon. There was to be a Shakespeare birthday festival at Stratford-upon-Avon, commencing on April 17, so the Easter holidays would allow me to put in about five days, or rather evenings, and one matinee in the first week. Was it worth while giving up London for Stratford? As things turned out, quite. The little place was crowded on the Monday, Bank-Holiday, and the Hotels had been booked full up for weeks ahead, but the amiable hostess of the Falcon-hotel, a quaint 17th century inn, got me an out-room in the next street, and meals at the hotel. Of course this is not exactly the cheapest plan, and I will point out a better way to intending visitors presently. The next important thing to do was to secure the orchestra-stalls which I had written to reserve. They keep them till about noon on the opening day, unless of course you prefer to remit the money earlier. For the birthday-night, Saturday April 22nd, the Memorial Theatre had been booked full more than two months ahead. Seven shillings for Orchestra stalls is not too much, if you remember that you pay 12/- for the corresponding seats at the West-End theatres in London.

As to the performances I will permit myself a few remarks later on — but first, see the romance of travelling: there was also a Conference on “New Ideals in Education”. Few people in Holland know anything about this, at least in the very remote part of the country whence I date these few jottings. I was not much deterred by the prospect of its being all “shop”; it would at any rate be shop with a difference; the very thing to keep one engaged, hearing and perhaps speaking English. For one guinea one received a cardboard badge of membership with a green ribbon to pin it to the lapel of one’s coat or jacket. Now the reverse of this badge bore a red seal with a gothic R, that puzzled me. Of course it might be some masonic symbol or the like? No, it stood for Restaurant, and meant that Members of the N.I.E., were entitled to free teas at one of the best restaurants. I found out that for an inclusive fee of £ 3. 3.— I might have had full board, lodging for a week, admission to all the lectures, reading room, common room, light supper after evening entertainments and many more advantages, great and small. And that is what I intend to do next time.

At the hotel, there was excellent company. It was rather a stylish place, the sort of place where everybody suspects his fellow-guests of being

millionaires, and is inclined to keep up the illusion as to himself, practising the studied stare, eating the huge meal and making his contribution to the general dullness. The result is oppressive, for besides being deprived of the liberty to sing in your room and of wearing the clothes you feel comfortable in, you are condemned to silence. But there is little risk in breaking the conventions and the ice, and thus acquaintances may be struck up for the time being. That young aristocrat at your table proves to be a Canadian student at Cambridge, who can talk very well about Holland and wants to hear more. He has been in the war, and has come through it with a depth of seriousness which is a revelation in one so adorably boyish. The other quiet gentleman who takes some drawing out is a business-man; rather incongruously he is imbued with Anthroposophy, and if invited thereto, modestly puts forward his happy convictions, of which more anon. The next day there are two exceedingly high bred ladies, who disdain to speak more than an occasional monosyllable to one another. But make a French bow to them before sitting down, and you find that they have articulations in their necks and are very charming altogether. Of course they think the charabancs that the common ruck get about in very "trippy", they haven't brought their Rolls-Royce. Something in you keeps down the suggestion that they should get on to bicycles, for there are limits even to the foreigner's prerogatives. As there are no Germans anywhere near they take you for a Frenchman or a Roumanian, and are sure to mentally assign to you a social status several degrees higher than the rather bleak reality. It does not go to your head, because you have your own notions as to these matters of social standing, definitely revised since the war. Some of the most interesting people however are to be met at the Restaurant: a sub-editor of the *Manch. Gu.*, the independent paper; old Mr. Dent, the publisher, as broad but shrewd a Yorkshireman as anyone would wish to come across; a London solicitor; Montessori workers and anthroposophical devotees, mostly very nice people indeed. Having now sketched in the atmosphere, I may proceed to a more orderly account of some of the things seen.

The Hippodrome Theatre had been engaged as lecturing Hall and was just big enough to seat the 500 odd people who attended the more important lectures. The fair sex predominates inducing the atmosphere that turns the men into New Idealists for a week or the duration of the conference, but even they may carry potent seeds with them unawares.

Sir Henry Newbolt, the President of a powerful committee, in his Inaugural Address explained that the Conference was first instituted in 1914, so this was the eighth meeting. There is no incorporated Society, members of the committee are not elected, nor is the movement under the auspices of any official association, such as the Teachers Union. Yet there lives somewhere an essential nucleus and the "thing" lives on and grows. This year for the first time it was a spring-meeting; it was easy to realize that it was not summer! Out of about 400 persons present there were, and this was again a novelty, some fifty training-college students. Among the audience there were a few colonials, Americans, three French people and a Dutchman. Sir Henry put before the Conference a train of ideas that to his mind justified the existence of the movement, and the choice of the central subject: "The Drama in Education". The world had undergone an earthquake, and was now divided between two classes of persons who took opposite views with regard to the future: those who wished to get back as far as possible to the old grooves, and those who believed that

nothing which had hitherto existed could be of any value, because having been tested by a great crisis it had been found entirely wanting. It must be owned that the world before 1914 was practically based upon the exploitation of the majority. The world must try to retain capitalism without exploitation, and to afford general opportunities to enjoy the intellectual and other noble pleasures that life largely consisted of. One of the finest of these artistic recreations was the drama. Prof. Conford of Trinity College, Cambridge, sketched a profound new theory of the tragedy, its origin and its functions. This splendid lecture I could not summarize until I have the report which is to appear in a few months' time, when the 'Proceedings of the meeting will be published. It cut very deep, and incidentally raised a point of which a word more may be said. It was whether acting a part in drama would leave an unconscious deposit in the performer's soul which might then be either ennobling or harmful. In Hamlet the leader of the company, who gives the Hecuba-speech weeps *real* tears; and in Sonnet 111 the dramatist says of his craft that "almost thence his nature is subdued to what it works in, like the dyer's hand." If this means that acting makes a lasting impression upon the character, then with young people there was a responsibility for teachers to consider. The professional actors, represented among others by Miss Lena Ashwell stated that acting was not the absorption of emotion into the soul of the performer, and that when giving a part this was artistic reflection, produced by a brain and soul which has thoroughly experienced the emotions, without however being dominated by them. Acting Cromwell no more made one a statesman than the presenting of Iago made one a human fiend, though in both cases there was a sort of discharge or relief, of heroic aspiration or of the darker passion of envy which most human beings possess to a certain degree and have to be given a vent. Acting thus becomes a sort of safety valve for the discharge of emotion.

In the afternoon Mr. John Masefield, amusingly introduced by Mr. John Drinkwater (the author of the poems "Loyalties", not the drama "Loyalties", which again is by a third John, Sir J. Galsworthy), developed an exposition of drama as essentially a contest simplified in which circumstances must be extraordinary, characters very pronounced, the action precipitated and leading up to an uncompromizing conclusion. He believes in the unities, the chorus, the messenger, the god in the machine, and in fact in most of the ancient traditions. A drama is good when it gets you by the throat and it will do that if the author has brooded intensely on a crisis in remarkable lives. It did not sound very modern, but there was no mistaking the earnestness of the dramatist, and it served as an introduction to a performance of Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris, in Gilbert Murray's grand translation, by the Boar's Hill players. They are a little company of gifted amateurs from the village of that name near Oxford; it is the home of many leasured young students who have as their manager, general director and producer one of the leading playwrights of the day, Mr. John Masefield. The elocution was delightfully good, the command of the cultured voice refined though strong; they put their souls into it and made you forget that the Grecian gods are a little the worse for the lapse of time. And so the old play may serve the New Ideal: making Youth and School a happy and beautiful starting in life, the reserve to fall back upon when the evil day comes.

Mr. Dent, the publisher, introduced as one of the fathers of these conferences, pleaded for a chair of drama in all the universities, to work in close contact with and under instruction from the profession.

Miss Cicely Hamilton blamed the present low artistic level of the English stage to the commercialisation of the theatre, and to the corollary fact that the profession had allowed the public to dictate to it. She contended that the author and his actors ought to be the positive pole and the public the negative; the public must not initiate, though they have the right of refusal. Professional artists must have a certain amount of contempt for the mob. This spirited challenge led to a brisk discussion, kept within the bounds of good feeling and humour by the tact of Miss Ashwell, who presided over that part of the session. Her point was that there should be civic control of the stage and public grants to theatres, so that they could afford to give masterpieces. No such subsidies exist in Great Britain!

Whether Dr. Rudolf Steiner's lecture "The Drama in relation to Education" was the *pièce de résistance* or a side-show at this conference, depends on one's point of view. The author of the Threefold State and disciple of Goethe, is also a passionate student of Shakespeare. At the Goetheanum in Dornach and at Stuttgart the teachers work in the light of the Anthroposophical thesis. Despite the English temperament, loth to change old lamps for new, the professor has already a considerable following in the British Commonwealth. He contends that the spiritual being actually moulds the physical body; artistic and happy teaching causes the spiritual being to build beautifully and rhythmically within. An English translation from shorthand notes was fluently produced by George Kaufmann, M. A. Cantab. The speaker was clearly aware of the few who could follow his own words in German, and so your humble servant came in for a fair share of direct irradiation.

After the lectures there was a pleasant "at Home" at Hall's Croft, the house of Shakespeare's son-in-law, now the residence of the Earl of Sandwich, a perfect host. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Steiner and Mr. John Drinkwater were among the distinguished guests at Hall's Croft.

I will confine myself to this specimen day and now conclude with some remarks on the Shakespeare performances at the Memorial Theatre. The New Shakespeare Company was under the Direction of W. Bridges-Adams. Even this sacred shrine is used as a picture-theatre during the off season, but it nobly forgoes its profits for several weeks a year to allow homage to be paid to Shakespeare!

After a bustling performance of the "Taming of the Shrew" without the Induction — honestly no great loss — came the glory of the week: Othello. William Stack, in spite of his affected, stage-spoilt pronunciation played the Moor with shivering power; Baliol Holloway came through the test of acting Iago with an enhanced reputation; he understands the part; it must have been unpleasant for him to speak the motive-hunting monologues. Desdemona's frank worship of her Moorish husband, evidently a Christian and only just tawny, was acted with simple faith and honesty by Miss Ethel Carrington whilst that great actress Dorothy Green gave all the good and bad qualities of Iago's wife, the waiting-woman Emilia. A harrowing-beautiful play, alas!

I was not so impressed with Twelfth Night and with Much Ado About Nothing. Travesty, wooing or detecting unfaithful mistresses by deputy, induce a certain impatience when they become stock devices, and one is not always in a sufficiently buoyant mood to get over the glaring improbabilities. How, for instance, in Twelfth Night did Sebastian manage to sign the marriage-register when he was supposed to be Caesario? And in Much Ado when Claudio on second-hand evidence had refused his bride

at the altar, how could he agree to marry off-hand the anonymous girl offered in place of lovely, wronged Hero! Caddishness could not possibly further go, and that all ends well is no excuse for him. But it is excellent comedy apart from that. There is nothing more comical in Shakespeare than the fooling of Benedick and Beatrice into mutual love.

The surprise of the "Julius Caesar" was the casting of that consummate humorist Mr. Stanley Lathbury as Mighty Julius. I had feared the small company could not spare the right man for a not very clearly conceived character that appears in only four scenes and disappears before the middle of the play. He could not bring it off well. Cassius was not lean and hungry, nor intense enough; Brutus was a good twenty years too young, and the very clever Mark Antony put too little of the majestic consul and too much lago into it, for it was B. Holloway. Casca made a grim success of his surly prose. As a matter of fact the fourth and fifth acts do fairly well on the stage, better than the bare text would lead the unimaginative closet-student to think.

I will leave it at this for the present, and am willing to announce further conferences and dramatic festivals in due time, if this is agreeable to the editors and the readers of this periodical.

Leeuwarden, 25 April '22.

J. L. CARDOZO.

[Mr. Cardozo will oblige both by doing so. - Ed.]

Dekker and The Virgin Martyr. It may be of interest to readers of the short article on the subject mentioned above (*Engl. Studies*, Vol. III, No. 6), in which I made a few remarks with respect to the authorship of *The Virgin Martyr*, that my suggestion as to Dekker's and Massinger's shares in its construction is for the greater part borne out by an elaborate study from the hand of Mr. H. Dugdale Sykes in *Notes and Queries*, Jan. 28 and Febr. 4, 1922.

The verdict at which the writer arrives, though his deductions are based on internal evidence only, seems to me conclusive. He summarizes his investigations as follows: "Dekker is responsible for what is worst, and for a good deal of what is best in the play. The prose portions, the speeches of Hircius and Spungius, are certainly almost entirely his, but he is also chiefly responsible for Dorothea and Angelo. Massinger's share in the play is, however, larger than has usually been supposed. All that is distinctively "Roman" in the play is his, and he is entitled to some of the credit for several of the best scenes hitherto attributed to Dekker alone". For further information students may be referred to the analytical table at the end.

With regard to the question whether *The Virgin Martyr* was revised by Massinger or the result of conjoint authorship the writer comes to the not altogether definite conclusion that he inclines to the opinion that the two authors worked upon the play together and that it is the result of collaboration in the true sense of the term, which has also been suggested, though for two scenes only, by Prof. Cruickshank in his book on Massinger.

Rotterdam, 9 April 1922.

W. A. OVAA.

English Association in Holland. From March 27 to April 4 Mr. G. K. Chesterton was the guest of the Association and lectured successively at Rotterdam, Haarlem, Amsterdam, Groningen, Nijmegen, The Hague, Utrecht

and Hilversum. With the exception of Amsterdam, where he spoke on *Browning*, his subject at all branches was *Dickens*. No report of the lectures will be attempted here, as this has been fully done by all the leading newspapers. Certainly none of our lecturers before Mr. Chesterton has received such ample recognition from both press and public, and if this is not always a reliable index of the value of a lecture in itself, yet we do not believe that any of the distinguished foreigners that have appeared before Dutch audiences in the season now behind us, has compelled so much attention by the sheer attraction of his personality and writings.

By way of retrospect a list is added of the lectures given by English speakers at our various branches:

Amsterdam: Walker, Hamilton Fyfe, Chesterton.

Groningen: Adair, Hamilton Fyfe, Chesterton.

Haarlem: Walker, Adair, Hamilton Fyfe, Chesterton, Allen.

The Hague: Walker, Hamilton Fyfe, Chesterton.

Hilversum: Norman Angell, Hamilton Fyfe, Chesterton.

Nijmegen: Forbes-Robertson, Adair, Hamilton Fyfe, Chesterton.

Rotterdam: Walker, Hamilton Fyfe, Chesterton.

Utrecht: Walker, Adair, Hamilton Fyfe, Chesterton.

During the three terms of the session 1922-1923 the University of London will again organise "Courses on aspects of English life and civilisation suitable for students from foreign countries." A preliminary announcement was sent with the April number of *English Studies*, and the complete syllabus will be issued in June. Though intended for students from all foreign countries, the courses should appeal specially to Dutch students, as they were instituted primarily at the request of the *English Association in Holland*.

It is hoped that many of our undergraduates (and others besides) will take this unique opportunity of combining a course of study under the guidance of some of the greatest of English scholars with the observation of English life and civilisation at first hand.

Enquiries should be addressed to Dr. W. W. Seton, University College, London, and may also be made by members through the Association Secretary.

B- Examination 1921. We copy the following remarks from the official report (*Staatscourant* no. 57):

„De aanschrijving van Uwe Excellentie aan den voorzitter betreffende de regeling der akte-examens, no. 578, afd. M. O., behelzende, „dat wellicht dit jaar reeds met de ten vorigen jare gehouden examens rekening zou kunnen worden gehouden in dien zin, dat, ook al wordt het examen dit jaar in zijn geheel afgenomen, toch een candidaat niet wordt afgewezen, omdat hij in een bepaald onderdeel onvoldoende wordt bevonden, indien hij ten vorigen jare voor datzelfde onderdeel voldoende werd geacht,” is aan een paar kandidaten ten goede gekomen.

Het gehalte van de algemeene ontwikkeling en de kennis van de kandidaten, voor zoover die bij de examens bleken, was zeer bepaald geringer dan in vorige jaren.

Wat bijzonderheden aangaat, bij het nazien van de opstellen bleek het dat lang niet alle kandidaten behoorlijk aandacht hadden geschonken aan de opmerkingen door vorige commissies gemaakt.

Meer dan eens kwamen slordigheden voor als Julius Ceasar, Cassio in

plaats van Cassius, en on-Engelsche verkortingen als S. W. Scott, Browning's Par. Soms was het moeilijk na te gaan of met woorden als Macbeth en Hamlet de persoon of het drama bedoeld was. Ook de lijsten van gelezen en bestudeerde werken, door de kandidaten vóór het examen ingezonden, vertoonden dikwijls onnauwkeurigheden, als Gay's Elegy voor Gray's Elegy, Rossetta voor Rosetti.

Een enkele maal was de leeslijst niet in overeenstemming met de waarheid."

Shelley Centenary Number. On or about July 8th we will publish a special number in commemoration of the death of Percy Bysshe Shelley. We have been fortunate in securing the collaboration of Mr. Albert Verwey, who has consented to contribute a Dutch translation of *Alasior*, Mr. J. de Gruyter who has written an essay on *Shelley and Dostoievski*, and Mr. J. Kooistra who will contribute an article on Shelley and a bibliography of recent publications of and on Shelley's works.

The number will be rather more than the ordinary size, and will be sent to our regular subscribers as usual. Members of the English Association in Holland may buy it at the price of f 1.00. Subscribers to E.S. may also buy extra copies at the same price by ordering them direct from the publishers.

This number will take the place of the one otherwise published in August.

Translation.

The Great Work.

1. "I am sure you will never succeed." 2. Louise Couvret had spoken these words, in a somewhat mocking tone, to her husband. 3. Fred sat with bowed head and nervously crumpled the blotted paper between his fingers. 4. There was no reply to make. 5. It was the twentieth time at least that his wife had made this annoying remark and the worst of it was: he felt she was right.

6. Yes, he was not capable of producing a work in which he could excel. 7. He always had to confine himself to indifferent sketches or short articles that were required of him.

8. It is true, formerly a novel of his had been published, and then he had cherished illusions, had felt that instinct to work and had continued writing.

9. His surroundings believed in his talent, but those who admired him, his mother, his sister, his friends were people who were very fond of him and therefore did not see the faults in his work. 10. It was his wife alone who had opened his eyes by her slighting words and that cold, ironical look.

11. A hundred times he had begun that great work. 12. A hundred times he had torn up the sheets in a rage, telling himself that what he wrote was nonsense and that he had better throw the whole thing into the fire. 12. He was sitting quite still and his thoughts went back to those happy days, alas, but few, at the beginning of his married life: their walks in that glorious avenue, with apple-trees in full bloom on each side; those delightful intimate talks, their total absorption in each other....

14. Now it seemed to him as if he had not kept his pledged word, for in the three years that he had been married, he had not kept the promise he had made to Louise,

he had disappointed her in his talent and in his dreams of the future — a fortune perhaps.

15. Disillusion had gradually come upon Mrs. Couvret. 16. The fine plans he had made proved but idle wishes, and instead of the wealth he had led her to expect, they could live but simply. 17. "That does not matter, does it, darling?" Fred had said, "we shall not mind, as long as we have each other." 18. What did the applause of the public, marks of esteem, matter to him, now that Louise was his. 19. But there had been a loud laugh, a laugh that had frozen him.

20. "You know very well Fred, one can't live on love alone. 21. That is all very well in the novels you write or rather think to write."

22. Then something snapped in his heart.

Observations. 1. *I feel certain; I know for certain.* Not *I know as certain*, which is due to the confusion of one idiom with another (*know for certain; regard as certain*).

2. *Had said these words.* — *On a derisive tone* is wrong. The correct preposition is *in*. 'Soh! you're come!' he exclaimed, in a deep, derisive tone. (Ainsworth, *Tower Hill*).

3. *Fritz* is the German form, the English equivalent is *Fred*, see Karl Breul's German Dictionary published by Cassell. — *Bent head; bowed head.* *To bend the head* simply means to bring it into a state of curvature; *to bow the head* = to bend it in token of submission, humility or respect. And Moses made haste and bowed his head towards the earth (*Exodus XXXIV, 8*). See Günther, *Synonyms*. — *Verknoeien* does not mean *spoil* in our text, but *crumple(up)*. She crumpled the cheque in her hand and walked to the door (Sala, *Seven Sons*, XII, 307). N.E.D. defines: to crush together in an irregularly folded state. He saw Drysdale crumple up the notes in his hand (Hughes, *Tom Brown at Oxford*). N.E.D.: to crush together in a contracted or compressed state [*verfrommelen*]. — *Crushed the inkstained paper in her fingers.* This use of *in* is not very common; cf. however: Daphne, with both elbows on the table, was slowly crunching a morsel of toast *in* her small white teeth. (H. Ward, *Daphne*, Ch. III.). *The paper smudged with ink* is correct.

4. *He could not answer her. He was at a loss what to reply.*

5. *It was certainly the twentieth time that his wife made this tiresome observation.* In reality the action is completed, but the notion of completion is often left unexpressed: I (have) come to fetch my mother. *Tiresome* expresses quite a different idea, that of exhausting the patience, tedious.

6. *Unable to produce.* — *To deliver a work.* In this context the word would mean *afleveren*, *bezorgen*, Cf. *delivery-van* [*bestelwagen*]. *To compile a work* would imply that the author merely collected what other people had written. — *A work with which he might shine out; (eclipse).* Though he failed in tragedy Pieter Langendijk could *shine* in comedy (Downs and Jackson, *Manual of Dutch*, p. 19). Those qualities wherein Frederick surpassed all mankind were as yet unknown to others or to himself; for they were qualities which *shine out* only on a dark ground. (Macaulay, *Frederick the Great*.) The people who were stupidest before, suddenly *shine out* quite brilliantly (Quoted N.E.D.) There was a special reason which made me resolved to *shine* at this ball at whatever cost (*Harper's Magazine*, 1889, 561). The intransitive use of *eclipse* is absolute, according to the Oxford Dictionary.

7. *He had but to restrict himself* = Hij behoefde zich slechts te bepalen. *Mediocre* (not *moderate*!) *sketch.* *Moderate* usually expresses

absence of excess: a moderate opinion, price. The play had a *moderate* success, being acted but seven times (Dobson, *Selections from Steele*). Eighteen years old, of *moderate* stature (*Pearson's Magazine*, 1909, 292). He was only *moderately* rich (*Royal Magazine*, 1910, p. 434). So you think you are *moderate* in your demands? (*Ships that Pass in the Night*.) — *Articles imposed upon him*. In this sense *impose* means: to lay on as something to be borne, endured, or submitted to; to inflict, to levy or enforce authoritatively (*N. E. D.*). Eastern women know nothing of the convention which *imposes* calm upon our womanhood (Introduction to Burton's *Thousand Nights and a Night*). To impose a tax, a fine. — *Articles ordered to him* = besteld bij hem. The correct preposition after order is *from*, not *to*.

8. *A novel by him* is correct. — *Had been edited*. Editing differs from publishing in that it is restricted to the work of the man who puts the text into order for publication and provides it with such illustrative matter as it is deemed to require. The publisher is the person who bears the expense of printing it. (Bradley) Cf. the German Herausgeber (editor) and Verleger (publisher). — *He had deluded himself*. To 'delude' is to deceive by creating a wrong idea in the mind, so that *delusion* is essentially taking up the wrong notion. This notion may be one altogether false, or it may be simply exaggerated. We are deluded by the fair promises of a hypocrite, and by the plausible arguments of the sophist. There are few people now who cherish the *delusion* that Turkey will reform herself (Davidson). Shamefully *deluding* me and making me your cat's paw (*Strand Magazine*, Dec. 1904, p. 647). — *Had felt that great energy*. Not quite equivalent to our *werklust*, which word is not given either by Dr. Prick van Wely or ten Bruggencate. German Instinct to Work: Germany is the only country in Europe to-day where I have discovered the will to work (*Evening News*, Aug. 12, 1921). — *Has proceeded his writing* makes nonsense, *proceed* being an intransitive verb. See E. S. IV, p. 36.

9. *Had faith (confidence) in his talent*. Our faith in the feminine capacity for keeping a secret was not so far-reaching. (*Harmsworth Magazine*, 1899, p. 559). — *Mistakes in his works*. A mistake is an error of perception, a fault an error of judgment. He who is gratified with that which is *faulty* in works of art, is a man of bad taste (Smith). To denote an imperfection in workmanship *fault* is the most suitable word.

10. *Sarcastic look*. *Irony* is covert sarcasm. — *Despicable, contemptible, contemptuous, disdainful words*. The first two are passive, the last two active as regards their meaning. *Despicable* is stronger than *contemptible*, a person may be contemptible for his vanity or weakness, he is despicable for his servility and baseness of character. Words, actions and looks are contemptuous; looks, sneers and gestures are disdainful. The last word applies only to outward marks of contempt.

11. *Begin upon* is correct: I will not begin upon it till I come to a stop in Kehama (Southey, *Life*, III, 163).

12. *Torn the sheets* does not express the same idea as *torn up the sheets*. See N. E. D. i. v.: Expressing either partial or complete separation of parts; in the latter case with adverb or adverbial phrase, as *to tear up, to tear in (or to) pieces*. Composition here serves to express the perfective aspect: see Kruisinga, *Acc. & Syntax*³, § 238. They are always careful to join the small pieces lengthwise which makes it impossible to tear the cloth in any direction but one (Quoted *N. E. D.*). Engaged in tearing up old newspapers into small pieces (*Ibid.*). — *Cheating himself with the idea* = zich wijsmaken d. — *It was humbug*. I believe a notion is growing prevalent that

half what is said and written about the dangers of the Alps is mere *humbug*. (Tyndal, *Glaciers*).

13. *His thoughts recurred to* is right. 'I did it for the best', said Job, his thoughts recurring to the apoplectic Sir Scipio (Douglas Jerrold, *Men of Character*). — *Marriage*. Crabb says: *Marriage* is oftener an act than a state; *matrimony* and *wedlock* (more formal word) both describe states. The word is taken in the sense of a state when we speak of the pleasures or pains of marriage; but in this latter case *matrimony*, which signifies a married life abstractedly from all agents, or all acting persons, is preferable. What causes young people to come out but the noble ambition of *matrimony*? (Thackeray, *Vanity Fair*). I remember your old jeremiads against *matrimony* (Von Hutten, *Pam*, V, Ch. VI.). — *On either side*: Poutsma (II, 1702), observes: "Either with the meaning of *one and the other* is getting more and more unusual. According to Murray (s. v. *either*) is it "felt to be somewhat archaic and must often be avoided on account of its *ambiguity*." Sweet (quoted in Storm, *Englische Philologie*³, 1044), observes that it "is very common in writing in English, but I cannot imagine any one speaking it". — *Lane* does not render Dutch *laan*, but corresponds to our *landweg*.

14. *His plighted word*. — *The three years he was married* should be *had been married*. When the action or state is represented as continuing up to a point of time in the past the pluperfect is the normal tense, the preterite appearing but occasionally: From a child Surajah Dowlah *had hated* the English (Macaulay, *Clive*). See Poutsma, *Mood and Tense of the English Verb*, *Tense*, p. 120, or Kruisinga, *Accidence & Syntax*, § 94, (Third ed., § 115).

15. *Little by little*. (*By little and little*). — *Mrs. C. had been disillusioned*. *Disillusion*: Troilus and Cressida is the comedy of *disillusion*. The young enthusiasm of Troilus is miserably disenchanted (Dowden, *Shakespeare Primer*). The def. article should not be placed before this word, abstract nouns, taken in a general sense, dispensing with it.

16. *The fine plans turned out to be empty dreams*. (*Had vanished into smoke (air)*). — *Riches* is originally a singular, but the syntax of the word shows that it is now apprehended as a plural. — *They could live but plainly* is correct. I suppose he lives very plainly (Buchan, *Watcher by Threshold*, 289).

17. *We shall resign to our fate*. The intransitive non-reflexive use is marked rare by Craigie (*N.E.D.*) I will hope still the best and resign to God's will (Richardson, *Pamela*, IV, 173). Sophia and Emily Selwyn endeavoured to resign their destiny (Eugenia de Acton, *Nuns of Desert*, I. 288). *Fate* seems too strong a term under the circumstances. The lad gasped but submitted to his fate (*Century Magazine*, 1901, 675.). *So long as we have one another*. All right, so long as it tastes like Christmas pudding (*London News*, 18th Dec. 1909.). *So long as* in colloquial speech has sometimes the meaning 'if only': You won't fall *so long* as you hold on tight (Onions, *Advanced Syntax*, § 57a, and Kruisinga, *Accidence & Syntax*³, § 1949).

18. *Now (that) Louise was his*. *That* is frequently omitted, especially in conversational English. Rowe and Webb disapprove of this shortened form (*Guide to the Study of English*, p. 235), but the conversion of adverbs to conjunctions has been frequent in English (e.g. *before*, *until*, etc.); see Kruisinga, *Accidence & Syntax*³, § 1804.

19. *A guffaw* is quite wrong (= a burst of coarse laughter). *Had benumbed (stiffened, stifled, stunned) him*. None of these are right.

20. *That is all right in the novels you write or better, think you write*. *Better* is obsolete in the sense of *rather*. The Oxford Dictionary gives a

quotation from Caxton's Jason : He semed *better* a thing of that other worlde thenne an humayne persone. — Denkt te schrijven should not be rendered by a dependent clause, the meaning is 'expect' here.

Good translations were received from Miss T. B., Kollum; Miss B. M. C., Tilburg; Miss M. G., Amsterdam; Miss A. H., Flushing; Miss D. K., Tilburg; Mr. G. J. K. at L.; Mr. J. P. L., Giessendam; Mr. R. v. d. M., Hengelo; Mr. H. M. A. H. K., Flushing; Miss R. C. O., Arnhem; Mr. J. P. P., Rotterdam; Miss A. J. E. S., Gorleston-on-sea; Mr. B. S., Koog a/d Zaan; Mr. K. de V., Dokkum, Mr. B. de W., Moordrecht; Mr. H. v. d. W., Steenwijk; Miss A. B. V. v. Z., Hasselt.

Translations of the following text should be sent to P. J. H. O. Schut, 60 Maarlant, Brielle, before July 10th. They will be returned with corrections if accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope. No translation will be included in the July number.

De Sneeuwbal.

Het sneeuwt maar altijd door. Van morgen, toen de school uitging, heeft de sneeuw een leelijk ongeluk veroorzaakt. Pas waren eenige van de jongens buiten of ze begonnen sneeuwballen te maken, met die waterachtige sneeuw, ballen zoo vast en zoo hard als steenen. Verscheidene menschen kwamen op de trottoirs voorbij. Een heer riep: „Pas toch op bengels!” en op hetzelfde oogenblik hoorden we een smartelijken kreet van den overkant van de straat, en we zagen een ouden man, zonder hoed, wankelen en zijn gezicht in de handen verbergen, en naast hem stond een jongen, die al maar riep: „Help! help!” Dadelijk schoten een menigte menschen van alle zijden toe. De man had een bal recht in het oog gekregen. De kinderen stoven uit elkaar. Ik stond voor het venster van den boekverkooperswinkel, waar mijn vader in was gegaan, toen er eenige jongens kwamen aanloopen en zich tusschen de anderen, die naast mij stonden, mengden, en deden of ze de uitstalling bezagen. Het waren Garone, Coretti en Garoffi, de postzegelverzamelaar. Intusschen had zich een kring om den ouden man gevormd en een politieagent en anderen liepen rond en vroegen: „Wie heeft het gedaan? Wie heeft het gedaan?” en ze wilden de handen van de jongens zien, of ze ook nog nat waren van de sneeuw. Garoffi stond naast me — ik merkte op, dat hij van het hoofd tot de voeten beefde en doodsbleek was. Ik hoorde Garone zachtjes tegen hem zeggen: „Komaan, zeg, dat jij het gedaan hebt, het zou laag zijn, om er een ander voor te laten boeten.” „Maar ik heb het niet met opzet gedaan!” antwoordde Garoffi, bevende als een blad. „Dat komt er niet op aan, je moet het toch doen”, herhaalde Garone. „Maar ik heb den moed niet!” „Kom, durf nu eens een beetje; ik ga met je mee!” De agenten en de omstanders riepen al luider: „Wie was het? Wie heeft het gedaan? Ze hebben hem blind gemaakt, de ellendelingen!”

Ik vreesde, dat Garoffi op den grond zou vallen. „Kom,” zei toen Garone, „ik zal je verdedigen,” en hij pakte hem bij een arm en duwde hem voort, terwijl hij hem als een zieke ondersteunde. De menschen zagen het, en begrepen het dadelijk; velen kwamen met gebalde vuist aanloopen.

Reviews.

La Pensée de Milton.

To the Editor of *English Studies*.

Dear Sir,

In order to supplement your note on my letter in the April issue of your journal, I should like to state that Prof. Saurat and his reviewer had both turned to me and asked my opinion on the review and finally placed the matter in my hands *with the very fullest confidence* in the justice of my sentence, in order to prevent increased bitterness on both sides.

May I ask you kindly to publish these lines in your journal?

I remain, dear Sir,

Yours very sincerely,

S. B. LILJEGREN.

Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates and the Problems of the Transmission of his Text by ALFRED W. POLLARD, Sandars Reader in Bibliography 1915. Second Edition, Revised with an Introduction Cambridge, University Press, 1920.

The booklet the title of which I have transcribed at the top of this notice is very instructive, entertaining, and interesting, and makes excellent reading. It tackles several sorts of bibliographical problems, and by thus proceeding new light is cast on some ancient rather intricate questions and cruxes of Shakespeareology. After an introduction of twenty-one pages in which the labours of the author and others, notably Mr. Dover Wilson, Dr. W. W. Greg, Mr. W. Jaggard, Mr. Alfred Huth, Mr. William Neidig, Mr. Percy Simpson, and Sir Edward Maunde Thompson are mentioned, there follow the four lectures, reprinted and revised, which were delivered in November, 1915, in the University of Cambridge under the terms of the Sandars Readership in Bibliography. The central idea of these lectures is that early editions upon which a text of Shakespeare's plays must be built, are a good deal closer to the original manuscripts than most of the text-builders have allowed. The chapters dealing with this and kindred problems are entitled: *The Regulation of The Book Trade in the Sixteenth Century*; *Authors, Players and Pirates in Shakespeare's Day*; *The Manuscripts of Shakespeare's Plays*; and *The Improvers of Shakespeare*. Of course there is an Index.

It would be rather difficult to single out such passages as stand out conspicuously by their importance, but I should like to call attention to the various proclamations of the sixteenth century in connection with the book trade. We hear of several proclamations being issued by divers kings and queens, but they seem to have had very little effect. Here is the close of one by Edward VI given on the 28th of April, 1551, (Mr. Pollard calls it a querulous proclamation on the worst possible lines) which I quote for curiosity's sake:

And forbicause diuers Printers, Bokeselers, ank Plaiers of Enterludes, without consideration or regarde to the quiet of the realme, do print, sel, and play whatsoever any light and phantastical hed listeth to inuent and deuise, whereby many inconueniences hath, and dayly doth arise and follow, amonge the kinges maiesties louying and faithful subiects: His highnes therfore straightly chargeth and commaundeth that from hence-furth, no printer or other person do print nor sel, within this Realme or any other his (*sic*) maiestis dominions, any matter in thenglish tong, nor they nor any other person, do sel, or otherwise dispose abroad any matter, printed in any forreyn dominion in thenglishe tongue, onles thesame be firste allowed by his maiestie, or his priuie counsayl in writing signed with his maiesties most gracious hand or the handes of sixe of his sayd priuie counsayl, upon payne of Imprisonment, without baile or mayneprice, and further fine at his maiesties pleasor.

In other proclamations we find trespassers threatened with banishment, confiscation, and other punishments, but human nature apparently remained human nature still, and love of gain did its work as well as in our own times.

Particularly interesting also is the story of the publication of Shakespeare Quarto's p. 48 sqq., and though now and again some doubts may arise, I believe the author's standpoint towards the quartos is on the whole plausible and sound. Summing up his views on the subject Mr. Pollard recapitulates the contents of his book as follows:

"It has been the object of these papers to show that the Quarto's regularly entered on the Registers of the Stationers' Company were neither stolen nor surreptitious. I have gone further than this by bringing together some little evidence that some at least of these editions may have been set up from Shakespeare's autograph manuscript, and have further dangled before my

readers the hope that in some of these much vilified texts there may yet survive evidence of how Shakespeare meant some of his great speeches to be delivered. This is as far as bibliography can take us".

A very pleasant and convincing little book.

EDWARD B. KOSTER.

The Works of Shakespeare edited for the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press by SIR ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH and JOHN DOVER WILSON, 1921—

This new Shakespeare edition 'nimble and sweetly recommends itself' unto our eyes by its artistic exterior. To see such tasteful volumes on his shelves is in itself a pleasure for the booklover. Fortunately on perusal the first highly favourable impression is not in the least impaired. This edition has indeed so many good points, that it is difficult to imagine it soon superseded by another. The Cambridge Shakespeare will in our opinion take pride of place among Shakespeare editions for many years to come.

A survey of the contents of the first volume *The Tempest* will show what wealth of matter is put at the student's disposition. After an excellent reproduction of the Droeshout portrait, we find a general introduction by Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch, in which he traces "Shakespeare's progress towards canonisation" with abundant quotations and references and some original and penetrating observations on Shakespeare's art. It is followed by a textual introduction by Mr. Wilson who explains by what principles he has been led in the handling of his material. He tells us, that in the last decade the study of Shakespeare texts has been given a new trend by three discoveries. The first is that of Mr. Pollard, who demonstrated that 'dramatic MSS. which reached the printer's hands in Shakespeare's day were generally theatrical prompt-copy, that many of these are likely to have been in the author's autograph, and that therefore the first editions, the quartos in particular, possess a much higher authority than editors have hitherto been inclined to allow them.'

The second by Mr. Percy Simpson, who showed that the stops in the folios and quartos are not the 'haphazard peppering of ignorant compositors, as all previous editors have regarded them, but play-house punctuation directing the actors how to speak their lines'.

The third by Sir Edward Maunde Thompson, who has made it seem very probable, that 'one of several hands found in the confused and partially revised manuscript play *Sir Thomas More* was that of Shakespeare himself, and that therefore we now have three pages of authentic Shakespearian copy in our possession.'

These discoveries are surely of sufficient import to justify a new careful study of the accepted texts. As, however, the results attained by making use of them are here shown for the first time, so that they could not yet be verified and definitely approved of by other scholars, the present editors have prudently relegated the emendations they propose to the Notes, and except in a very few cases no changes have been made in the text itself. After Mr. Wilson's very interesting discussion of these discoveries, there follows an introduction to *The Tempest* by Q., a portrait of Elisabeth, a 'Note on Punctuation' and then after the play itself, a discussion of the copy used, a facsimile of 16 lines from the 'Shakespeare' addition to *Sir Thomas More* with a Transcript, twenty pages of Notes on corrupt or doubtful

passages, a short piece on the Stage History of *The Tempest* by Harold Child and lastly a Glossary in which difficult words or expressions used in an unfamiliar meaning, besides puns and quibbles are explained.

The only feature of this admirable edition which we cannot quite appreciate is the insertion of stage-directions. In general we can hardly imagine a reason important enough to justify any tampering with the text of a classic — excepting of course the correction of obvious printer's errors. It is true that stage-directions leave the actual text untouched, yet indirectly they may influence the meaning of a line or a passage and sometimes they are even intended to do so. An editor who undertakes the exceedingly delicate task of adding such material of his own, is foredoomed to err either by giving too much or by giving too little. If he makes bold to invent ample and frequent directions, such as a reader expects to find in a modern play, he will almost certainly offend by insinuating his own opinions and predilections too strongly; if, on the other hand, he restricts himself to a few harmless words, to indications which — as is so often the case in Shakespeare's plays — can be very easily derived from the dialogue, they serve no useful purpose. Fortunately the editors of the present edition have on the whole followed the latter course, which is at any rate far less censurable than the first; they have been diffident and circumspect, but while thus avoiding offence they have contributed little if anything to the clearness of the action.

The three other volumes published till now: *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor* and *Measure for Measure* — the editors follow for an inscrutable reason the order of the First Folio — keep up the very high standard of the first. In some parts — notably in the Introduction to *The Merry Wives of Windsor* — new and interesting theories are propounded, which we intend to discuss in a following number.

A. G. VAN KRANENDONK.

Die Englische Literatur der Neuesten Zeit. Von DR. LEON KELLNER.
Leipzig, Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1921.

The writer of a book like this takes upon himself a threefold task. First of all we expect from him, that he shall provide us with a reliable and well-furnished storehouse of the mere facts of literature; secondly that he shall interpret these data — indicate their interrelation, connect them with social and political phenomena, arrange them into a historical summary; thirdly we may expect some æsthetic valuation of at least the chief works of art mentioned.

Even a very exacting student will, we think, be satisfied with the mass of information put at his disposal in the four hundred large pages of this tastefully bound, well printed volume. Of every-one of the authors treated — even the minor ones — he will find a complete list of works and, what is a valuable feature of the book, a good and often extensive list of books and articles in which he can find further information and criticism. Of the more important figures full biographies are given besides notes on: "Persönlichkeit, Weltanschauung, Einfluss, Stellung in der Literatur, Geistverwandte Dichter, Schriftstellerische Art" and so on, while those curious in such matters will be glad to learn, that even about the lives of minor men they may find carefully collated details, which, though at the first blush they may seem of lesser importance in the history of literature or perhaps

not even strictly necessary to a right understanding of a work of art, are extremely interesting "an und für sich." We mean e.g. a scrupulous precision of proper names as in:

"Philip Bourke Marston 1850—1887, der Sohn des Dramatikers John Westland Marston, bei dessen Taufe Philip James Bailey und Dinah Maria Mulock Gevatterschaft standen..." (p. 268). —

Or a religiously exact enumeration of place (and hotel!) names as in: "(Thomas Lovell Beddoes) er erschien wie ein Irrlicht in Baden (im Aargau), Gieszen, Basel, Straszburg, Mannheim, Mainz, Frankfurt am Main, London, dann wieder in Frankfurt, wo er mit einem Bäckergesellen namens Degen innigste Freundschaft schloz, endlich im Storchhotel zu Basel, wo er in Jahre 1849 Gift nahm und starb" (p. 175). —

Or again a narration of lively biographical incident as: "Horne (Richard Hengist).... In der Bucht von Vera Cruz wurde er beinahe von einem Haifisch gefressen...." (p. 174).

But the author has by no means restricted himself to an accumulation of biographical facts. He sees the 'main currents' in the spiritual life of the epoch as well as any other writer and so we read e.g. that: "Die Wurzeln der neuen Literatur vielfach ins 18 Jahrhundert hineinragen", or that "Um die Mitte des 19 Jahrhunderts die Seele der Frau im englischen Schrifttum zum Wort kam" or that: "Der Naturalismus Zolas fast zwei Jahrzehnte brauchte um den Weg nach London zu finden" and many more well-known truths like these. But in the whole chapter 'Das Gepräge des Zeitalters' with its sequel: 'Einige Hauptmerkmale der Viktorianischen Literatur', we failed to find anything new or personal, anything giving evidence of a more than ordinary historical or philosophical insight.

The principle that has determined the order in which the great figures of the epoch have been treated, is found, somewhat curiously worded, in the preface:

"Dies ist das Buch der Könige die da herrschten im Reiche des englischen Schrifttums vom Jahre 1837 bis zum Jahre 1901."

He then gives a row of the names and dates of these kings, reminding us of the chronological tables in our schoolbooks of history:

"Im Jahre 1837, dem Jahre der Pickwickier, kommt Charles Dickens auf den Thron, das Jahr 1838 bringt Edward Bulwer seinen groszen Theatererfolg; 1839 erobert Carlyle die erste Stelle unter den lehrhaften Schriftstellern seiner Zeit; 1843 rückt das Lied vom Hemd den Stern des armen, verbrauchten Thomas Hood ins Gesichtsfeld des groszen Publikums..." etc.

In this order then — 'nach den Höhepunkten der Anerkennung' — the 'kings' are treated, so that e.g. the two great novelists Dickens and Thackeray are discussed apart, separated by seventy pages on Bulwer, Carlyle, Thomas Hood, Disraeli and their followers. Has this method really such great advantages over that which keeps the novelists, the critics, the poets, the historians of the period together in separate chapters? Surely the kings did not reign for one or two years, replacing one another, but during the whole period. In 1846, the year of *Vanity Fair*, the influence and popularity of Dickens was as strong as that of Thackeray, if not much stronger. In 1843 '*Das Lied vom Hemd*' did not set Carlyle's teaching aside, nor did in 1847 *Jane Eyre* cause a revolution in the English mentality; by that time and much later the influence of all the other great writers since 1837 was still far stronger than that exercised by Charlotte Brontë and so it seems pretty immaterial, whether in a history of the Victorian period Carlyle is treated before or after Thomas Hood and somewhat arbitrary and fanciful

to keep Dickens and Thackeray far apart simply because the latter's first great success came a few years after the first literary victory of the former. Moreover Dr. Kellner's method is hardly more strictly chronological than that generally followed by writers of literary history. They give us first a history of the poetry of a period, then a history of the novel, of criticism etc. Dr. Kellner begins with the year 1837 and treating Dickens and his imitators he carries us as far as about 1890, then he jumps back to 1838 and traces the history of Bulwer's influence up to about 1900, then we are taken back again to 1839, Carlyle, and so on. How this mixing up of novels, poems, criticism, etc., this constant harking back to the beginning of the period can have 'den groszen Vorzug der Einfachkeit' the author claims for it, we fail to see. But Dr. Kellner seems to attach great importance to his treatment of authors in the order of their first great success. Unfortunately he has kept the reasons for his preference in the dark, throwing out only some modest hints about the elaborate study and long cogitation that preceded the taking of the decisive step:

"Wollte ich alle meine methodische Erwägungen und Versuche die dem endgültigen Entschlusse vorangingen, hier auseinandersetzen, so würden sie eine Schrift für sich geben, "Wie soll man Literaturgeschichte schreiben?" und zwar würde sie die verwandte Arbeit Luzians bei weitem an Umfang übertreffen".

We think Dr. Kellner sets far too high a value on 'Anordnung' in general and on his own method in particular. As a matter of fact the quality of the various essays on great men of the period, which form the gist of the work, is of incomparably greater importance than any order whichever.

On the whole these essays form interesting reading. Those on the older writers are, we think, the best. We may especially note the one on Dickens with its clever analysis of Dickens's humour; the fine study of Carlyle, in which notably the chapter on 'C. und Goethe', and 'C. und der deutsche Idealismus' contain many original remarks; those on Thackeray, Disraeli, the Sisters Brontë; also the chapter on Stevenson, which gives a very good idea of Stevenson's personality and work and a just estimation of the artistic value of his imitators.

Towards the end of the book there is, however, a decided falling off. It seems, that Dr. Kellner has devoted much less study to the newer writers than he has given to the old familiar Victorian figures. The title his work bears on the cover: 'Die Englische Literatur der neuesten Zeit' is somewhat misleading, since on the strength of it a reader might reasonably expect to find at least a few words devoted to men as Galsworthy, Arnold Bennet, Compton Mackenzie, Lawrence, Walpole, Cannan, Walter de la Mare, Rupert Brooke, Gibson and a host of others whose names are not even mentioned.

The author would have done better to have kept the original title: 'Englische Literatur im Zeitalter der Königin Victoria', for the few additions have not really changed the character of his book, hardly any writer or work later than 1901 having been treated.

As a history of Victorian literature, especially of its older stage, Dr. Kellner's book has its value on account of some scholarly studies on the greatest representatives of the period. Those, however, who want to get some insight into the present state of English literature, its currents and tendencies, the work of the artists of the *newest* times, will find this volume of very little use.

A. G. v. K.

A Dictionary of Military Terms. By E. S. FARROW. London, The Library Press Ltd. 1919. \$ 3.50.

A book of this kind was bound to come. As was to be expected, Germany was the first in the field with her lexicon of war words, France followed suit with two or three, and now, at last though not yet too late, we have one in English. But unfortunately it is a blessing in disguise, so to speak, hailing as it does from New York City and not from London Town, although it was published in the latter place. This being the case, it presents only one aspect of the subject, viz. the American. At any rate the latter predominates, which is of course quite natural. Though this is a drawback, it is one of minor importance after all, since in this particular domain of the language of languages there is on many points no difference between official Yankese and English pure and undefiled. Another drawback of the book under review, viz. the fact that it will be far from easy for the foreign and the non-military reader to discover where the two languages do differ, might have been easily done away with. It would be unfair, however, not to state that in this direction there is some help from the author, who occasionally adds a bracketed [English] to his explanation. The only thing to be regretted is that this practice has not been followed right through the book. Is, e.g., *Leonard powder* an English or an American invention? The same question may be asked with regard to *Fogerty gun*, under which entry there is no indication at all as to the nationality of the true begetter of this weapon. The case is different with, for instance, *Abbertini gun*: "a form of battery gun having ten barrels as in the Requa battery". Now, the *Requa battery* being "a kind of mitrailleuse, used at the siege of Charleston in 1863", we feel at once on solid, i.e., American ground.

From the above instances it may be seen that the usual type of reference book has become altogether inadequate for the student who wants to know all there is to know about the latest development of English as a world language under the influence of the most terrific war ever waged in the history of mankind. But what is seen as clearly is the fact that even this special dictionary does not meet all the student's wants, however grateful he may be for what he is given. And there is sufficient cause for gratitude, for not only the smaller dictionaries but also the larger ones, the model N. E. D. not excepted, have become utterly out of date as regards war words as we know them, the larger being even greater sinners by omission than their numerous more or less pocketable offspring in consequence of their being worse sellers, thus missing the opportunity of a repeated if not regular re-edition — with or without an appendix. Many of these war words, it is true, have already been consigned to unrecorded oblivion, not even *verba et nihil ultra*, yet many there are, too, that will live as long as the immortal unknown soldier who once breathed his soul into them on the stricken field, each of them not only a word but *monumentum aere perennius*, for ever honouring the brave brother-at-arms or branding the brutal foe with the mark of the beast. Will *poilu* and *Boche* ever be ousted from the dictionary? It is a consummation devoutly to be wished, but, alas, as long as the word *revenge* as a military term (not given) is not obliterated from human memory *lasciate ogni speranza*, you conchies and pacifists and... peaceful lexicographers! Mr. Farrow's book is also a monument, a monument to the living and at the same time a memento for the dead in the realm of words. His past work on a *Military Encyclopedia* from his pen has stood him in good stead as a groundwork for his undertaking. But considering

this circumstance, are we not justified in asking ourselves why he has not drawn a rigid line of demarcation between the two, so that he that runs may read and find immediately what he is looking for, that is to say the new words of Armageddon birth, ephemeral as their life may be or have been. How many readers will be interested in the dead material given? Such a demarcation would have been an easy task for the author, since no existing source new or old has been neglected by him and many terms and expressions have been obtained from documents in the U. S. War Department, still others being secured from foreign War Offices, works of reference, and the most recent field reports of actual observations on the battlefields of Europe. All this is given and more, for an effort has been made to include in one volume brief descriptions of all important military terms and inventions of ancient and modern times, whereas a considerable quantity of slang and matter pertaining to foreign armies has also been introduced.

As regards slang, we are obliged to Mr. F. for such contributions as *fly-specker*, in the sense of the French *abruti*, "a plodding cadet"; *pepper-box*, another name for the *Allen pistol*, first manufactured by Ethan Allen and a favourite weapon with the "fortyniners"; *joe-emma*, and others not even recorded in the New Webster, which, being of a later date, might have laid Mr. Farrow's work under contribution. But to our great surprise we miss such familiars as, e.g. (*Big*) *Bertha* of universal fame, although the far less renowned *Big Boys* are honoured with an entry. What the student will sorely regret, too, is the lack of graphic authentic quotations illustrating the use of the words dealt with. Let us hope that the new compilation to be issued under the auspices of the Army War Museum will make a living thing of the present skeleton by means of the vast mass of matter placed at its disposal. A model book of the kind by the way, is Gaston Esnault's *Le Poilu tel qu'il se parle*, published by Bossard (Paris, 1919) In this connection I make free to refer the author to the word *arrosage*, not only a French term meaning "the moistening of gunpowder in manufacture", but also: "bombardement méthodique", as may be seen from Esnault's book. This is not the only word that might have come in for fuller treatment. Take, e.g., the never absent *Alboche*, according to Mr. F.: "a slang term of the trenches applied to all countries having German affinities." Applied by whom? That is the question, for the French *Alboche* is simply a perverted *Allemand*, the former word being the original of the more widely used apocope *Boche*, not only applied to the German Soldier (F.), but also to the German in general, the Austrians being the *Austroboches*. The word is not an abbreviation of the French word *Caboche*, as Mr. F. would have it. I refer the author to Esnault's book again, where it says: "L'origine du suffixe *boche* est obscure, on peut l'attribuer à des mots usuels, comme *caboche*, ou argotiques, comme *saboche*, de *sabot*, comme *liboche*; mais c'est déjà une explication provisoirement suffisante de le rattacher à d'autres suffixes qui offrent la même consonne d'appui, ...*broque*, *bif*, *bi*, *baque*, *bard*, et surtout à ceux qui offrent, sous la même structure de consonnes que *boche*, la même nuance des diverses voyelles: *bèche*, *-biche*, *-bige*, *-bache*, *-buche*". (p. 37).

However, I have not space enough at my command to go deeper into this *querelle d'Allemand*, so I leave it at that to turn to a good English term, culled from the very first page, to wit, *able-bodied*, as applied to one who is physically competent as a soldier for all duty. But in England the term is also used with reference to the Navy to indicate a special class of seaman, the A. B. Strange to say, even the N. E. D. is silent on this

point, which has not escaped the editors of the C. O. D., that masterpiece of conscientiously scientific condensation. The word is also fully and admirably treated in the new Webster. As was already pointed out above, some words entitled to a place in this dictionary are conspicuous only by their absence. Is not, to quote another instance, *according to plan*, the German *planmäßig*, a very living and perhaps immortal — at any rate in history — military term, still widely used, especially outside its military sphere, in books and newspapers? Nevertheless it cannot be traced in Mr. Farrow's volume. Further (to confine myself to the letter A) the student will fail to find *A. P. O. C. (?)*, *acceptance officer*, *action front* and *action rear*, *aërobatics* (as a companion to *aërodonetics*), *agony-waggon*, *agricultural officer*, *aid-post*, *air base*, *air bomb*, *air bump*, *air circus* (of Richthofen fame), *air merchant*, *air padre*, *air tractor*, *Allemand*, *all-round traverse*, *Ally Sloper's Cavalry*, *Amex* (an abbreviation for American Expeditionary Force), *angary* (English form of *angaria* duly given), *the angel's whisper* (the equivalent of the Dutch military bugle call "sokken verkocht"), *anti-flash gear*, *anti-Zeppelin bullet*, *Antrim* (Irish soldier from Antrim), *area controller*, *armament school*, *army compounder*, *artillery duel*, *Aussie* (Australian Soldier — cf. *Sammy* and *Tommy*).

I will not, however, lay down my pen without a word of cordial thanks to the author for his instructive, interesting and stimulating book, which, in spite of its shortcomings, may prove a great help to the general reader, who is of course less exacting than your professional lexicographer. Living in the glasshouse of publicity myself, it is not for me to throw critical stones at my brethren of the Johnsonian quill, yet a word of warning may not come amiss to some of our dictionary revisers and revivers, who will be confronted with such howlers as, for instance, *Black Maria* = "soort groot kanon, kogel", or *pipsqueaks* = „kanonnen, kogels" again, not to mention ephemeral *dixies* = potatoes (of all things!) where camp-kettles were meant, and a now exploded *barrage* = „belemmering vóór de loopgraven"! The very original spiritual fathers of these monsters would do wisely to invest some of their hard-earned copy-money in Farrow and study its contents from cover to cover. Its 676 pages would not be too much even as an impot.

Maastricht, Nov. 1921.

F. P. H. PRICK VAN WELY.

Brief Mention.

Lessons in English Grammar. By E. KRUISINGA and J. H. SCHUTT. Kemink. Utrecht, 1922. 175 + 15 pp. f 3.25.

In a way this booklet may be looked upon as a companion volume to the second volume of the *Handbook*, which was announced in the April number of *English Studies*. But the student is also frequently referred to other books, especially Jespersen's *Syntax* and some studies by Stoffel. Its aim is to show learners how they should study grammar, chiefly syntax, not by theoretical discussion but by practical examples.

The value of the study of the living stage of a language for scientific purposes is discussed in the introduction; in this connection we quote here the words of one of the leaders in Anglistic studies, professor Luick, who wrote recently: „Ich bin schon lange der ansicht (und vertrete sie in meinen vorlesungen), dass viele feinere syntaktische studien nur an der lebenden sprache gemacht werden können, weil der vorstellungsinhalt den der sprechende mit einer form oder fügung verknüpft, unmittelbar beobachtet werden kann.... Genaueste beobachtung des lebenden sprachgebrauches ist daher auf dem gebiete der syntax ganz besonders wichtig."

E. K.
J. H. S.

Bibliography.

PERIODICALS.

Modern Language Review. XVII, 2. April 1922. Incl.: M. Ashdown, The Single Combat in certain Cycles of English and Scandinavian Tradition and Romance. — G. D. Willcock, A hitherto uncollated version of Surrey's Translation of the Fourth Book of the *Aeneid*.

Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine. 1921. Vol. XIV (Section of the History of Medicine). Includes M. Montgomery, "Cursed Hebena" as *Guaiacum officinale* (or *Lignum vitae*) in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, I, V, 62.

Modern Language Notes. XXXVII, 4. April 1922. Includes: A. M. Clark, Thomas Heywood as a Critic. — T. Brooke, Stanza connection in the *Fairy Queen*.

Id. XXXVII, 5. May 1922. Includes: H. S. Pancoast, Did Wordsworth jest with Matthew? — W. Farnham, Scogan's 'Quem Quaeritis'.

Revue germanique. XIII, 2. Avril-Juin 1922. Includes: R. Lalou, Note sur un point de terminologie Meredithienne. — F. C. Danchin, Le roman anglais (1921).

Mélanges du Cinquantenaire de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes. (Sciences Historiques et Philologiques). Abel Lefranc, L'Origine d'Ariel.

La Vie des Peuples. 10 Mars 1922. H. Ruyssen, Le théâtre irlandais.

La Grande Revue. Déc. 1921. J. Guechenno, Les tendances nouvelles de la littérature américaine.

Språkvätsenskapliga Sällskapet i Uppsala Förhandlingar. Jan. 1919 — Dec. 1921. Uppsala. A.—B. Akademiska Bokhandeln. 1922. Includes: Eddastudier av Erik Noreen.

Englische Studien. 56, 1 (Jan. 1922). O. Funcke, Die fügung ginnen mit dem infinitiv im me. — J. Koch, Ein neues datum für Chaucers *Queene Anelida* and *fals Arcite*. — V. Langhans, Zur Ffassung von Chaucers Legendenprolog. — S. B. Liljegren, Ethisches und literaturanalytisches zur Milton-frage. — Reviews (including Ries on Sommer's *Vergleichende Syntax der Schulsprachen*, and Helene Richter on Shelley, *A Philosophical view of Reform*. — Notes and News. — **Id.** 56, 2 (April 1922). Special number in honour of Professor Alois Pogatscher's seventieth birthday. — Ludwig Schuch, Alois Pogatscher zum 70. wiegenfest. — Karl Luick, Sprachkörper und Sprachfunktion. — Max Förster, Englisch-Keltisches. — F. Huttenbrenner, Probe eines metrischen wörterbuchs für das Altenglische. — A. Eichler, Zur Quellengeschichte und technik von L. Tiecks Shakespeare-Novellen. — S. B. Liljegren, Defoes Robinson. — W. Horn, Ne. solder. — O. Richter, Zu einigen ortsnamen aus Oxfordshire. — F. Karpf, Beiträge zur kongruenz im englischen. Reviews. Note by Professor Hoops on Keats.

Beiblatt zur Anglia. 33, 1 (Jan. 1922) Reviews, including Fehr on *Die Engl. literatur der neuesten zeit von Dickens bis Shaw* by L. Kellner. — Mutschmann, Zur psychologie des verfassers der Nachtgedanken. — **Id.** 33, 2 (Feb. 1922). Reviews, including Horn on *A Contribution to an Essex Dialect Dictionary* by E. Gepp and an appreciative review by S. B. Liljegren of Saurat, *Blake and Milton*. — **Id.** 33, 3 (March 1922). Reviews, including Ekwall on Cook's edition of the O.E. *Elene*, *Phoenix* and *Physiologus*, and on Liebermann, *Ort und zeit der Beowulf-dichtung*.

Germanisch-Romanische Monatschrift. IX. 11-12 (Nov.-Dec. 1921). Includes H. Schröder, Hyperkorrekte formen vortoniğer silben im deutschen und niederländischen. — Jan de Vries, Die Brautwerbungssagen I. — Wilhelm Horn, Die wort- und konstruktionsmischung im Englischen. — Albert Eichler, Shakespeares begriff des gentleman. — Notes. Reviews. Bibliography. — **Id.** X, 1-2. (Jan.-Febr. 1922). Includes F. R. Schröder, Neuere Runenforschung. — A. Heusler, Über die balladendichtung des spätmittelalters, namentlich im skandinavischen Norden. — Notes. Bibliography. — **Id.** X, 3-4. (March-April 1922) Includes: Hübener, Scholastik und Neuenglische hochsprache. — Notes. Reviews. Bibliography.

Neuere Sprachen. XXX, 1-2. (Jan.-Febr. 1922). Beginning with this volume the periodical will treat systematically of the teaching of Italian and Spanish as well as English and French¹. The present number contains an interesting essay by professor Deutschbein on the infinitive and gerund, in which an attempt is made to sketch the logical development of the infinitive from a nominal to a verbal form. The weak points of the article seem to be the neglect of the historical development of the form, and, in connection with this, the mistake of treating the accusative and infinitive without *to* as the accusative with infinitive. — Notes. — Reviews.

Zeitschrift für franz. und engl. Unterricht. 21, 1 (1922). Includes an obituary notice by the new editor of Prof. Max Kaluza, with a bibliography of the professor's own work, and a list of dissertations under his direction. — Notes and News. Reviews.

¹) Annual subscription £ 7.—.

Shelley and Dostoievsky.

There was a great love for mankind in both these men, but how different the forms which it took in their works. It almost seems the difference between the child and the old man, between the high-spirited, rebellious child, living in a fairy world of its own creation, a fairy world of human light and reason, as dazzling and brilliant as ever one was created, and the man, nearing the end of his life, who has gone through all the depths of human woe, who has sounded all the shallowness of human understanding and to whom human light and reason taste bitter on the tongue.

Idealism and realism, rebellion and humility — we see them represented in these great and mighty spirits.

But let us examine somewhat more closely their lives and thoughts to see what was in them

Shelley was born in 1792 and lived his days in a land of reaction. The England of that period was perhaps as much afraid of change in its religious and political institutions as the Russia of Dostoievsky. Instead of to Siberia the men of daring and reform were sent to Botany Bay in Australia, the British Siberia.

The passions roused by the Terror had completely arrested the progress of the revolutionary movement. The alarms and glories of the struggle with Napoleon buried it in oblivion.

It was a time of oppressions and wars, of squandering kings and bigoted priests, of prejudices and crimes, of prisons and hangmen, of poverty — squalid, submissive poverty, and luxury — arrogant, irresponsible luxury. To the ordinary mortal such a time seems common enough, normal perhaps, inevitable in any case. Not so to Shelley, this "beautiful and ineffectual angel beating in the void his luminous wings in vain", as Matthew Arnold has called him.

Ineffectual? — No, not quite. Beauty as such is never ineffectual. But even in a moral, even in a more material sense — no not quite. Such powers as Shelley's, such clear-sighted indignation, such hatred of evil, such love of purity and freedom, such belief in human progress, they never pass from this world without leaving their traces. Shelley himself is one of those "chosen and consecrated spirits", under whose magnetic leading he saw mankind going forward to perfection. Others follow in their glittering track.

What forces lay at the basis of these powers and beliefs? In the first place the nature of the man himself. A very rare character, a most vigorous temperament, a strong and innate devotion to goodness and virtue, a daring and original mind. Shelley's was a mind which accepted nothing without testing it. Even as a boy he judged the world by his own standards and found it wanting, found it full of wrongs that had to be righted. At Eton he is said to have led a rebellion of small boys against fagging. He was called "the Atheist" there and this, according to Hogg, was an official title given to him, not because he did not believe in God, but because he was a daring rebel. But even before Eton he appears to have dedicated himself to the weak and oppressed. The following scene from the *Revolt of Islam* refers to his boarding-school days:

Shelley-Number E. S.

I do remember well the hour which burst
 My spirit's sleep: a fresh May-dawn it was,
 When I walked forth upon the glittering grass,
 And wept, I knew not why; until there rose
 From the near schoolroom, voices, that, alas!
 Were but one echo from a world of woes —
 The harsh and grating strife of tyrants and of foes.

And then I clasped my hands and looked around —
 But none was near to mock my streaming eyes,
 Which poured their warm drops on the sunny ground —
 So without shame, I spake: — "I will be wise,
 And just, and free, and mild, if in me lies
 Such power, for I grow weary to behold
 The selfish and the strong still tyrannize
 Without reproach or check". I then controlled
 My tears, my heart grew calm, and I was meek and bold.

In a more complete and perfect way he gives us his views of what he considers the duty and aim of man in the beautiful stanza of *Prometheus Unbound*:

To suffer woes which Hope thinks infinite;
 To forgive wrongs darker than death or night;
 To defy Power, which seems omnipotent;
 To love, and bear; to hope till Hope creates
 From its own wreck the thing it contemplates:
 Neither to change, nor falter, nor repent;
 This, like thy glory, Titan, is to be
 Good, great and joyous, beautiful and free;
 This is alone Life, Joy, Empire, and Victory.

Note the first two lines: does not this prophet of Joy give therein the whole kernel of Dostoevsky's spirit — the challenge to suffering, the unlimited forgivingness.

It was these instinctive beliefs more than anything he learnt from others which led him in his actions, in the life of body and mind. In later years they may have expressed themselves in the forms and phraseology of the contemporary philosophers of his day, but the driving power came from Shelley's own nature. He always felt so sure of his own goodness, it was so natural to him to love and to be brave, he lived such an unworldly, selfless life, so entirely devoted to the beauty of virtue, that he never understood, never could understand the actual growth and development of the follies and vices, the intolerance and greed, the constant occupation with self-interests, so common in the ordinary man. In other times and under other circumstances he would have been worshipped as a saint. There's something of the saint in his extraordinary ways of practising benevolence: he once returned home barefoot in midwinter because he had given his boots to a poor woman. With the saint he had also in common the overwhelming spirituality of his mind. There was ever present in his mind:

The future and the past are idle shadows
Of thought's eternal flight.

He hated the flesh and he was hardly of the flesh. Thought was the essential thing in his make-up, and an idea, an impulse, a spiritual emotion was more real and more comprehensible for him than those things of body and earth, of whose existence the senses persuade us. It was no rhetoric, no affectation when he saw the immortal shapes of "Desires and Adorations", the "glimmering Incarnations of Hopes and Fears and twilight Fantasies" lamenting over the bier of Adonai's or when he turned the Cloud into a living creature and made us follow it in all its phases and travels.

There lay a danger in this overpowering feeling of his own righteousness, this unshakable conviction in the matter of first principles. Shelley was scarcely aware of any imperfection in himself. He always saw life as a conflict between his own nature and the world outside him, not as a conflict between different parts of his own nature. It needs must give to the enemy or onlooker the impression of conceit or arrogance. Yet it was never the crude and stupid insolence of more selfish minds — his pride was quite free from selfish purposes and full of generosity; he was a most lovable man and the best of friends — but a kind of intellectual, spiritual fanaticism, which gave him an almost infallible trust in the values he put on men and things, and made him judge these in a rather absolute way as good or bad, without acknowledging the fact that all men form a mixture of good and bad qualities in a most complicated, indecipherable way.

Shelley missed entirely that imaginative insight which can make its own the motives and desires of other men. That great quality of Dostoevsky, which made the novelist penetrate so deeply into the mind of the criminal and the prostitute, was entirely lacking in Shelley. He would not have driven them away from his door, his kindness understood without knowing, he once wrote to Byron: "The weak and the foolish are in this respect like kings — they can do no wrong". But there was not the attitude of the fellow-sinner and -sufferer in him as in Dostoevsky. We may call it an imperfection, but this imperfection may well have been the counterpart, the necessary counterpart of a perfection. Even the light of the greatest has its shadows and to see the light in its full strength we must have the shadows. There was an innocence and purity in this poet which kept vice at a distance. And we may ask if he would have been the great creator of so many imperishable songs, if he would have been the strong and luminous spirit, in irresistible flight taking us to another and a better world, more real to him than the one we live in, if he had not had this unassailable and uncompromising trust in his own character and judgment, if he had not been the Shelley we know and love. This then is the principal motive power in Shelley's life and art: the concentrated worth, the gemlike, unconquerable strength of his character and genius.

Other influences will add themselves to this one and shape to some extent his ideas and beliefs, but this was the great central fact that made the poet Shelley.

Of both the innate pride and kindness of Shelley Leigh Hunt's anecdote of a scene on Hampstead Heath gives us such a characteristic picture that I venture to repeat here the main lines of it though it may be known to many readers.

Finding a poor woman in a fit on the top of the Heath, Shelley carries her in his arms to the lighted door of the nearest house, and begs for

shelter. The householder is going to slam it in his face with an "impostors swarm everywhere" and a "Sir, your conduct is extraordinary." "Sir", cried Shelley, "I am sorry to say that *your* conduct is not extraordinary.... It is such men as you who madden the spirits and the patience of the poor and wretched; and if ever a convulsion comes in this country (which is very probable) recollect what I tell you. You will have your house, that you refuse to put this miserable woman into, burnt over your head".

This strong feeling of justice, this overmastering idealism, turning into the constant desire and preoccupation for reforming the world, remained part of Shelley's being, his aim in life, till the end of his days. But it was fed and strengthened, it received its more definite and final external shapes from the influences of his age. Shelley was the spiritual child of that great stream of thought which, taking its origin in Greece, had a brilliant revival in the *Renaissance* and stirred Europe by its new and daring ideas in the days of the *Enlightenment* and the *French Revolution*. Beaten, at least in England, for all practical purposes, beaten there until at a much later date the Chartist movement raised anew the banner of revolt and gathered for another forcible expression the idealism that had roused the men of 1789, this great movement lived on, a more or less hidden and lingering life, in its writers and philosophers.

Tom Paine, the author of *The Rights of Man* and *The Age of Reason* must have been a great inspiration to Shelley's ardent and inflammable young mind, Tom Paine, a veritable hero, whose deed was as good as his word, and of whom it is said: "Poverty never left him, yet he made fortunes with his pen and gave them to the cause he served.... A better democrat never wore the armour of the knight-errant; a better Christian never assailed Orthodoxy. No one since him or before him has stated the plain democratic case against monarchy and aristocracy with half his spirit and force".¹⁾

And Shelley must have felt the influence of that most admirable woman, the pioneer of the Women's Movement in England, Mary Wollstonecraft, mother of that Mary who made him as understanding and devoted a wife, as Anna Grigorovna was to be for Dostoevsky.

But the man who had the greatest influence in shaping Shelley's opinions was William Godwin and especially his book *Enquiry concerning Political Justice*. Through this book Godwin, the greatest figure of the Enlightenment in England, more indeed than "a shabby philosopher" as Mr. Clutton Brock calls him in his interesting *Shelley, the Man and the Poet*, and in any case a very brave and independent mind — became "the Apostle of Universal Benevolence", a philosophic system based on the dogma of human perfectibility as first presupposition of progress. For this was Godwin's strongest point, that though the notion of *evolution* would take its domineering place in the development of human thought at a much later date, he was a great believer in the *idea of progress*. The human mind is, according to his teachings, a raw material capable of almost unlimited variation and therefore of an advance towards perfection. But like most, if not all the reformers of the Enlightenment, in their hatred of kingcraft and priestcraft, of law and custom, of despotism and orthodoxy, he looked for the means thereto almost exclusively in external circumstances. Moreover, being an extreme individualist, he neglected in his reasonings the importance of the economic factor in social changes.

¹⁾ H. N. Brailsford, *Shelley, Godwin and their Circle*.

The most valuable chapters in Godwin's book are those which give his penetrating criticisms of existing society. But to the young men of his day, as Mr. Brailsford remarks, "the excitement lay in his picture of a free community from which laws and coercion had been eliminated and in which property was in a continual flux actuated by the stream of universal benevolence". For some years Coleridge, Southey and Wordsworth were in such high spirits about it that "they resolved to found a community based on Godwinian principles and to free themselves from the cramping and dwarfing influences of a society ruined by laws and superstitions, they lit on the simple expedient of removing themselves beyond its reach". How Coleridge and Southey, bent on founding their Pantisocracy on the banks of the Susquehanna, went to Bristol to charter a ship, and instead... married the Fricker sisters, is one of the most amusing tales in English literary history.

The excesses of the Terror frightened these young men away from all revolution and even reform; they soon settled down into quite respectable and obedient citizens. But Shelley, who came at a later time and was therefore not in the same direct way impressed by the violences of the French Revolution, and who was, this is the main difference, of a far more independent, unbending, inflexible nature, caught in his turn in the close web of logic of Godwin's *Political Justice*, always remained true to the advanced humanitarian ideals that once inspired him from its pages.

In religious as well as in political matters he was to a great extent a disciple of Godwin. Godwin's views were in the main what we now should call *agnostic*. "I do not consider my faculties adequate" he said, "to pronouncing upon the cause of all things. I am contented to take the phenomena as I behold them without pretending to erect an hypothesis under the idea of making all things easy. I do not rest my globe of earth upon an elephant (a reference to the Indian myth) and the elephant upon a tortoise". He regards with reverence and awe "that principle, whatever it is, which acts everywhere around me". But he will not slide into anthropomorphism nor give to this Supreme Thing, which recalls Shelley's *Demogorgon* of *Prometheus Unbound*, the shape of a man. "The principle is not intellect; its ways are not our ways".

True, Shelley's opinions and views in these speculative matters were modified to some extent by the great classical writers, Plato in the first place, of whom he was all his life and until the end a constant and devoted reader, and later on perhaps by Berkeley and other writers of a philosophic stamp, but the main lines, along which his thoughts flowed during the few years left him for his development, were those supplied by Godwin.

For what was living and human in the philosopher Shelley found imaginative expression. The well-reasoned arguments of Godwin formed not the least powerful stimulus that made Shelley into a thinker and poet, constantly occupied with the moral regeneration, some grand uplifting of mankind. The universal benevolence, preached by Godwin, became an affectionate, an ardent love for his kind in Shelley. Many of his ideas: perfectibility, non-resistance, anarchism, communism, the power of reason and the superiority of persuasion over force, the ascription of moral evil to the desolating influence of laws and institutions, ideas which, especially in his younger years, constantly return in his writings and which always kept to a greater or smaller extent their hold on him, must have come from Godwinian sources.

In his principle of passive resistance to evil, in his vegetarianism and other notions of conduct, Shelley appears to us as an early Tolstoy. Hardly more than a boy we see him busy at some practical efforts of reform. He

was never an abstainer from politics, never became the dogmatic individualist of *Political Justice*, always kept his faith in collective effort. Actuated by his youthful missionary zeal he made his journey to Ireland to forward the case of Catholic Emancipation and in a later year he issued his *Proposal for Putting Reform to the Vote*. Residence in Italy since 1817 cut him off to some extent from the practical politics of his mother-country and his mind seems to have become absorbed more exclusively by his poetical labours, but he kept taking a great interest in the social and political affairs of the world, as *The Masque of Anarchy* and many another piece of his latter years prove. His unfinished prosework *A Philosophical View of Reform*, mainly relating to the National Debt, also contains some remarkable pages of political insight and far-seeing argumentation. After all, Shelley was not so unpractical as men, in whom the ideal is absent, imagined him to be. Both Catholic Emancipation and a Reform of the Vote, as suggested by him, were carried at some later day. He was only ahead of his time and showed the way of the future as idealists generally do.

What interests us more however, because in this case he gave his ideals a more lasting form, is the way in which he showed us a regenerated society in his poems. He began painting us a millennium in *Queen Mab*, a rather precocious effort, not without its lines of glowing beauty though, especially that opening stanza, which marks it at once as a poem of ideas :

How wonderful is Death,
 Death and his brother Sleep !
 One, pale as yonder waning moon
 With lips of lurid blue ;
 The other, rosy as the morn
 When throned on ocean's wave
 It blushes o'er the world :
 Yet both so passing wonderful !

A more mature poetical representation of his view of life and some sketch of a regenerated world we get in the sublime mythology of *Prometheus Unbound*. There is neither psychological delineation nor action in this drama, and the characters are for the greater part so abstract that they fail to appeal to us from the ordinary point of view. But *Prometheus Unbound* comes nearer to music than perhaps any other drama that has been written and there is a kind of cumulative power in the emotion created by its succession of brilliant images. It is a drama of ideas, not of human beings, and Shelley, though not rich in his experience of human beings, was full of ideas and in incessant intercourse with them. That is what makes him a poet of the intellect: though he expressed himself in emotions — a true poet cannot do otherwise — they were always provoked by his ideas. The conflict of *Prometheus Unbound* is that between the ideas of freedom, independence, human love and self-sacrifice, all the virtues as Shelley saw them, in their opposition to the general conditions of the real world of his day (and many days to come), to greed, oppression, tyranny, to the many egotisms and vices, that have accompanied mankind on its wearisome, blood-stained way. In this gigantic conflict between god and anti-god lies its philosophic and human interest. It makes it the most brilliant representation of the rebellious mind, the mind of will and thought, of conscious power, always looking forward, always at work to overthrow the old and put up the new, the

mind at war with the laws and institutions of former generations, the spirit of the ideal in man aiming at an unfettered, unlimited development.

A third of his greater poems, the lyrical drama *Hellas*, a series of lyric pictures, as Shelley himself calls it, gives us another view of the existence in some transformed universe, more intimately blent than either *Queen Mab* or *Prometheus Unbound* with scenes derived from an historical event of Shelley's own time, the revolt of Greece against Turkey.

It is best known by its choruses:

Worlds on worlds are rolling over
From creation to decay
Like the bubbles on a river
Sparkling, bursting, borne away.

or that magnificent one at the end:

The world's great age begins anew,
The golden years return,
The earth doth like a snake renew
Her winter weeds outworn:
Heaven smiles, and faiths and empires gleam
Like wrecks of a dissolving dream.

But Shelley seems to have lost the boundless confidence of younger years and the end sounds more like a prayer than a prophecy. The tears of weariness and despair are in that final verse:

Oh cease! must hate and death return?
Cease! must men kill and die?
Cease! drain not to its dregs the urn
Of bitter prophecy.
The world is weary of the past,
Oh might it die or rest at last!

The Triumph of Life, the large fragment which he left unfinished, when he died, with that stately beginning:

Swift as a spirit hastening to his task
Of glory and of good, the Sun sprang forth
Rejoicing in his splendour, and the mask
Of darkness fell from the awakened Earth —

this poem, as it is left at present rather bewildering by its great accumulation of images, ends with an interrogation and the great mystery unsolved.

Shelley is often called a pantheist and if we see Pantheism in a feeling of unity, a sense of oneness with the Universe in all its manifestations, with men and plants and animals, with suns and stars, with all natural and cosmic things, perhaps no poet deserves that name with greater right. But in his moral views he shows us a distinctly dualistic attitude. In most of his larger, more philosophic works he represents life as a struggle between the hostile principles of Good and Evil. In his most masterly, his grandest way, he has done this in *Prometheus Unbound* where on the huge canvas

of Heaven, unfolded by his creative genius, he paints us, in glowing colours and gorgeous visions, a God and an anti-God contending for the world, an heroic idealisation of what he saw on earth.

Most decidedly and tersely we find this view of life stated in the first Canto of *The Revolt of Islam* :

Know then, that from the depth of ages old
Two Powers o'er mortal things dominion hold
Ruling the world with a divided lot,
Immortal, all-pervading, manifold,
Twin Genii, equal Gods — when life and thought
Sprang forth, they burst the womb of inessential Nought.

If Shelley called himself an atheist we must not see anything more therein than a challenge to orthodoxy and intolerance. He prided himself on the name, because Christians used the name of God to sanctify persecution and oppression. "It is a good word of abuse to stop discussion", he said once to his friend Trelawney, "a painted devil to frighten the foolish, a threat to intimidate the wise and good. I used it to express my abhorrence of superstition. I took up the word as a knight takes up a gauntlet in defiance of injustice".

As the two great ideals, underlying all others, in Shelley's life and work, *the moral regeneration of mankind* and *the passion for human perfection*, a perfection that should give a simultaneous delight to all the parts of man's nature, moral, intellectual and sensuous, and in which all conflicts should be reconciled, constantly press themselves upon the mind of the reader. Love was a means to that perfection. Even his love for women was always more a matter of affinities and sympathies than of the senses. It is a Platonic love, a love that is almost sexless. That is why he could say :

True love in this differs from gold and clay
That to divide is not to take away.

Epipsychidion is the most monumental of his lovesongs, and I may be allowed to quote here a beautiful page from Arthur Symonds' study on our poet: "*Epipsychidion* celebrates love with an icy ecstasy which is the very life-blood of Shelley's soul; there are moments, at the beginning and end, when its sympathy with love passes into the actual possession. But for the most part it is a declaration, not an affirmation; its love is sisterly, and can be divided; it says for once, exultingly and luxuriously and purely, the deepest thing that Shelley had to say.... Its only passion is for that intellectual beauty to which it is his greater hymn, and with Emilia Viviani, he confessed to have been the Ixion of a cloud. "I think", he said in a letter, "one is always in love with something or other; the error, and I confess it is not easy for spirits cased in flesh and blood to avoid it, consists in seeking in a mortal image the likeness of what is, perhaps eternal". In the poem he has done more than he meant to do, for it is the eternal beauty that it images for us, and no mortal lineaments. Just because it is without personal passion, because it is the worship of a shadow for a shadow, it has come to be this thing fearfully and wonderfully made, into

which the mystical passion of Crashaw and the passionate casuistry of Donne seem to have passed as into a crucible :

Thou art the wine whose drunkenness is all
We can desire, O Love !

and the draught is an elixir for all lovers". ¹⁾

We mentioned the great and characteristic quality which distinguishes the smaller, most perfect nature poems of his latter years: his feeling of unity in and with all natural things. It finds its most consummate and imperishable expression in such utterances as: *The Skylark*, *The Sensitive Plant*, *The Ode to the West Wind*, *The Cloud*. Was there after all not much of the pantheist in him? — How insoluble is the riddle of life. These myths, as they have been called, expressed that sense, which he possessed, of a more intense reality in nature than is to be felt by other men. "For Shelley these beings and forces of nature seemed to have as much reality as human beings have for most of us, and he found the same kind of intense significance in their manifestations of beauty as we find in the beauty of human beings or of great works of art. The nature of this significance he could not explain — no one can explain the ultimate significance of anything — but he could express it with enormous power in his art". ²⁾

There is a great deal of vagueness and diffusedness in Shelley's larger poems, both in his subjects and the treatment of his subjects, but his finest lyrics have a miraculous precision of statement, are more lucid and exact than any other poetry of the same kind.

Before finishing the first part of this paper, in which I have tried to give the reader some impression, slight as it may be, of the views and genius of Shelley, I have still to say a few words about the relation between the ideas of this "worshipper of reason" and his poetry. Verse is not an ornament added to prose, it is another means of expression. It is the means of expression of *beautiful emotion or emotion in beautiful flow*. All good prose has emotion and all good verse has reason in it as a means of expression, but the essential difference between verse and prose is that the one is most suited for the higher and lasting qualities of emotion and the other for the higher and lasting qualities of reason. Shelley was so essentially a poet that he expressed himself the fullest in poetry and that some of the most fervent admirers of his poetry find his prose lacking in force and character. It has some fine qualities and his *Defence of Poetry*, his *Essay on Christianity* are important contributions to his genius, as well as testimonies to his integral worth as a man, but the best of Shelley is not in them because the best of Shelley was not in his reason as a thinker but in his emotions as a poet. In these latter emotions, created by his ardent imagination on the basis and within the framework of his reason but outsoaring these as a skylark would outsoar the material framework of a building.

It is this gift which raises Shelley to a higher place than that of the mere prosewriter. True, the language of a prosewriter may come very near to poetry; some prose has many of the elements of poetry; but in a general way it may be said that the latter takes first rank in the hierarchy of art.

Shelley's imagination — always starting from some inner knowledge, some

¹⁾ Arthur Symonds, *The Romantic Movement in English Poetry*.

²⁾ A. Clutton Brock, *Shelley. The Man and the Poet*.

inner convictions, some inner beliefs — often passes into fancy and it is difficult to say, where the one ends and the other commences. In his glorious dreams and fantasies he often loses sight of all human and earthly limitations. It becomes impossible to follow him up and down and to all the points of the heavenly compass, amidst his ethereal, rainbow-coloured structures, on his peregrinations outside earthly space and time; we feel staggered and giddy amongst the mass of glittering abstractions and generalisations; our eyes get overstrained from this bewildering display of spiritual fireworks; our interest flags. Shelley's emotions, beautiful as they were, often lacked depth. They are for the greater part — perhaps it is a general characteristic of his nature — of a childlike, rapid, transient kind.

In that excellent little monograph, in which another great poet of a later period, Francis Thompson, gives us his views on Shelley, he describes in the following, profusely imaginative, way what he calls Shelley's "make-believe":

"The Universe is his box of toys. He dabbles his fingers in the day-fall. He is gold-dusty with tumbling amidst the stars. He makes bright mischief with the moon. The meteors nuzzle their noses in his hand. He teases into growling the kennelled thunder and laughs at the shaking of its fiery chain. He dances in and out of the gates of heaven: its floor is littered with his broken fancies. He runs wild over the fields of ether. He chases the rolling world. He gets between the feet of the horses of the sun. He stands in the lap of patient nature, and twines her loosened tresses after a hundred wilful fashions, to see how she will look nicest in his song."

This transient nature of his emotions is undoubtedly the reason that some of the best work of Keats or Rossetti takes hold of us with a firmer grasp, delights us in a still greater measure. In the fibre of these poets there is a greater intensity and concentration, and their most immortal verse has its roots in deeper layers of humanity. Some humanists may object to the word human in this connection but it is the greatest mistake we can make in our philosophy of life to think that the sense and love of beauty is not one of the most valuable, most essential, most indispensable of *human* feelings.

But if the greatness of Keats and Rossetti lies more in their separate works, that of Shelley shows itself in a more simple, direct way, drawing us with irresistible bonds to *his personality as a whole*. Keats and Rossetti are poets of a superior order; Shelley was a singer, plus a reformer, plus a seer; he was also a *most lovable* human being; the whole make-up of the man was of a less one-sided kind, full of a general spirit of enquiry and all-embracing sympathy. He moves swifter, his flights are farther and greater, he has the wide sweep of an eagle more than the passionate note of a nightingale. And if his palette does not contain the deeper, warmer colours of Constable, there is a width of horizon, a tremulous golden light, a richness and variety of form in his powers of vision and execution which Constable does not possess and for which only some of the most daring flights of imagination, the most gorgeous vista's of Turner might supply us with suitable objects of comparison. Shelley's is the less specialised, the more encompassing, more universal mind.

* *

Turning now from this dreamer of dreams, of whom I have to leave much unsaid, to that other great human being mentioned at the head of this essay, we find agreement in some important sense, but what a difference in others. Here this bird-like creature, this free, unfettered spirit, floating and soaring in the atmosphere of the heavens, in a glow and brilliancy of

his own making, showering his sounds, raining his music, out of that magic world of his poetic imagination, over a contending and hapless world, brightening and illuminating it as some spiritual sun or star, one of those spiritual suns or stars, which fill our lives with a new desire and meaning and hope.

And on the other side of our picture that sombre and suffering man, so full of the heaviness and sorrows of our earthly lives weighed down by a load of human woe as no human being before him has carried or could have carried, a load of human woe as, seen in the entirety of his life and works, would seem unbearable and insurmountable. And yet, we see him wrestle with it and time after time surmount it; we see him struggle for the light and repeatedly see the light; we see him succeed in effort after effort to create some sort of harmony out of that chaos and welter, that hot-house of doubts and horrors which was *his* mind and to a great extent *the world's*.

A wonderful man, as wonderful, but in such a different way, as Shelley.

Never should we think of comparing this man with a bird or a butterfly or a star. He is always so very, very earth-bound. So earthly, nay subterranean in his movements. Like some volcanic mass of humanity, bursting its crust and overrunning the earth in glowing, fiery masses. Its flames light up the surrounding world, beacons for the eyes of man during his temporary road on Earth, between the pains of birth and the pangs of death.

We called them both lovers of mankind. Yet, how different the ways in which they loved it! Shelley was a man, in the first place, of ideas; he was constantly occupied with his ideas; he saw mankind in abstractions and generalisations; he moves in a world of thought; men and women, skylarks and clouds, God and the Universe, all become subjects of thought, food for his boundless imagination. Behind this world lie history and temperament and his innate nature, but his chief business is thinking.

Dostoevsky's mind, on the other hand, more actuated by feelings than by thoughts and distrusting abstractions, found his spiritual food in the first place in the converse with his own mind and then in the intimate intercourse with men and women, which supplied him with these countless subtle details of human life and nature, that were to form the amazing and wonderful texture of his novels. Though possessed of a great power of logic and consecutive reasoning, he is, in the deeper motives and aims of his being, a man of impulse, of instinct, and that striking power of thought, which is given him, he uses in the service of those instincts, sentiments and beliefs. Not like Shelley's his mind is filled with the brighter glories and adornments, the beautiful emotions of man; it holds to a far greater extent the darker and deeper, the more primitive and ineradicable passions which no reason can subdue.

This idealist Shelley, this realist Dostoevsky — the one in his flights towards beauty and light, the other in his piercing analysis of the human mind, his understanding of human vices and failings — they complete each other in the exhibition of their rare, almost superhuman qualities.

Youth and old age, we said. It was true to some extent in the literal sense. Shelley died at an age when Dostoevsky had not reached his full powers of productivity. But it was far more true in an abstract sense. Shelley would always have remained a child; the author of *Poor Folk* was an old man when he started in literary life. At that age he had more experience of the deeper, more hidden workings of the human mind than most

of us ever will get. And there was less in him of the joys and exuberances and enthusiasms of youth.

Look at the faces: Shelley with his large, eager, questioning eyes, his countenance of "exceeding sweetness", his feminine, artless appearance, his spiritlike comings and goings.

And this other man, of whom de Vogue has left us a vivid picture: "Le visage était celui d'un paysan russe, d'un vrai moujik de Moscow: le nez écrasé, de petits yeux clignant sous l'arcade brillant d'un feu tantôt sombre, tantôt doux; le front, large, bossué de plis et de protubérances, les tempes renforcées comme un marteau; et tous ces traits tirés, convulsés, affaîsés sur une bouche douloureuse. Jamais je n'ai vu sur un visage humain pareille expression de souffrance amassée".

There's a wonderful innocence in Shelley, a purity of thought, of which the external way in which he deals with wickedness in *The Cenci* is only another proof; his imagination is continually aflow and aglow with the hungering for perfection, the dreams of an earthly paradise, the desires and adorations, of the youthful enthusiast; he lives in a constant state of ecstatic longing and joy. There's no innocence, but a fiercely scrutinizing and scorching power of analysis, a limitless experience, in Dostoievsky, a knowledge of the hard and bitter facts of life, of the realities, the monstrosities of sin and suffering, which seems the accumulated store of a whole century and a whole people.

Sin and suffering he has understood as no one before him. He is a discoverer of our underworld, the underworld in our own hearts, of which we dare not acknowledge the existence, from which we turn our eyes instinctively away. It is well that it should be so, the human instinct is right in its search for the light. With a sharpness, sometimes passing into cruelty, he plunges his knife of analysis into the impurities and accumulated festerings of the human mind, into its most hidden recesses.

A great understanding was necessary for this terrible work, an understanding of which sympathy with his fellow-creatures, pity for every phase of physical and mental suffering, must have been one of the principal elements. But also an unappeasable inquisitiveness, an intellectual curiosity that pressed him, in his own thoughts and conduct, as well as in those of others, to the exploration of the very deepest wells of human perversity and suffering and endurance, an unappeasable inquisitiveness with regard to the pathology of the human soul. By circumstances and temperament, by the horrible environment, in which he had to pass so many years of his life, he became a student of degeneracy and crime. There's the Will to Sorrow in Dostoievsky as there is the Will to Joy in Shelley.

The world of reaction in which Shelley wrote his poems, was disturbed and shaken and gradually modernised by the conquests of science and invention, by the new ideas of evolution and socialism, by the enormous increase of industrial power and economic wealth, by the rise of a new class, growing in vigour and vision, by the continuous conflict between this new class and the accumulated power of the bourgeoisie, by the changing views of life and human values under the influence of this struggle, by the political and social movements of 1830, 1848, 1870. But despotism and orthodoxy kept their rigid hold on Russia. New ideas, original thoughts slowly made their way into the powerful structure of Tsarist dominion and sapped its foundations, but its main supports and framework remained the same. It remained Tsarist Russia with its omnipotent autocracy, its corrupt and unwieldy bureaucracy, with the deep chasm between its intellectuals,

moved more or less by Western notions of liberty of conscience and thought, and the great mass of its citizens, of slaving, ignorant moujiks, in whom life flowed on as it did centuries ago: it remained Holy Russia.

Yet, there were stirrings in this sluggish mass of Russian life, stirrings emanating directly from Western ideas and progress, and stirrings, also no doubt to some extent connected therewith, of a more purely Russian, more patriotic nature. Ever since Kutusov beat back Napoleon, the giant began to feel his own feet, began to become aware of the immense powers, hidden in those wide stretches of soil, those enormous masses of people, which constituted the Russian Empire.

Such a feeling of youth and oneness, of great expectations and coming strength, always manifests itself in a strong patriotism, a rather excessive and overbearing patriotism, and it did so in Russia.

Gogol, the first great novelist of Russia and forerunner of Dostoevsky, a realist and a mystic like Dostoevsky, was also the first to give expression to these dreams of a nation coming to life, opening its eyes on a future of surpassing greatness.

In a beautiful and glowing passage of *Dead Souls* he gives utterance to that longing and those anticipations:

"Is it not thus, like the bold troika, which cannot be overtaken, that thou art lashing along, oh! Russia, my country? The roads smoke beneath thee, the bridges thunder; all is left, all will be left, behind thee.... Yes, on the troika flies inspired by God! oh Russia, whither art thou dashing? Reply? But she replies not! the horses' bells break into a wondrous sound; the shattered air becomes a tempest and the thunder growls, Russia flies past everything else on earth; and other peoples, kingdoms and empires gaze askance as they stand aside to make way for her".

In this intense patriotism Dostoevsky is of one mind with Gogol, but he goes further than Gogol. In his eyes "Russia, our Sacred Mother" is to become the Saviour of Europe. He believes in a new and glorified Russia, but — an intensely Russian Russia, a Russia slowly built up from the old foundations, the old political and religious institutions.

How intimately and inseparably his thoughts and sympathies are bound up with Russia never shows itself so clearly as in those dissatisfied, sometimes distracted letters which he sends home when residing in foreign countries. In one of these letters of 1869, he says: "In three months we shall have been exactly two years abroad. In my opinion it is worse than deportation to Siberia. I mean that quite seriously. I'm not exaggerating, I cannot understand the Russians abroad".

He is always full of bitter, unreasonable feelings against Germans, Frenchmen, Swiss and other nationalities he happens to live amongst. Of the Frenchman in Paris he says: "The Frenchman is suave, honourable, polite, but he is false and for him money is everything — no ideal, no convictions; do not demand from him even reflection". From Geneva he sends a wail to Maikov: "Everything is bad, everything is rotten, everything is expensive. They are always drunk here...."

A very ugly and negative feeling this, rather dangerous for people who did not believe in the idealisation of the moujik or in the Russian God, but in its sincere and passionate nature — and Dostoevsky was at bottom a man of passion, not of reason — the reverse of another, a very positive feeling: the strong feeling of unity with all things Russian, an intense sympathy for the Russian people, even in its lowest, most degraded members. "I assure you," he says in one of his letters "that I, for example, am so near

to everything that is Russian, that the convicts themselves did not alarm me; they were Russians, my brothers in adversity, and I had more than once the good fortune of meeting with greatness of soul in the heart of even a brigand for the sole reason that I was able to understand him, being myself Russian".

It has been his strongest support in life, these great hopes and expectations, firmly planted in the Russian soil, this unshakable belief in the Russian people and its old Faith, which made him say: "The destiny of our country consists in revealing to the world a Russian Christ, unknown in the Universe, and whose origin is contained in our own orthodoxy. In my opinion it is there that the source of our future civilising power, and of the resurrection through us of the whole of Europe and the whole essence of our future force, are to be found".

And in the light of his rejection of "that European fraud which they call civilization" and his acceptance of the Pan-Slav idea to make Constantinople the capital of Russia and St. Sophia the cathedral of the Russian faith, it does not seem strange to us that he should give his opinion about wars between nations as follows: "Without war people grow torpid in riches and comfort and lose the power of thinking and feeling nobly, they get brutal and fall back into barbarism".

This is the old belief in human instinct and the disbelief in human reason, so very, very strong still in most of our fellow beings — did not the great war transform some of the kindest men into raging tigers? — dressed here in the garb of a precept. It is this spirit, fully alive in the mystic Dostoevsky, which brought the calamities of 1914 upon us.

How far are we here from the "rationalism" of Shelley and his generous dreams of a united mankind, an earthly paradise of fraternising nations.

But, though it is well that we should try to see Dostoevsky as he is, not only in what we think admirable, but also in what we think objectionable in his nature or views of life, the fact that he was in some respects not among the best or rather the foremost of his contemporaries, must not blind us to his great qualities.

And the greatest of these was the depth, the penetrating insight of his human sympathy. The love of this realist was always of a more *domestic* nature than that of the idealist Shelley, but it was a great love all the same. He gave us a pure and unadulterated sample of it in his first novel: *Poor Folk*, when he had reached his twenty-third year. It is grey, rather melancholy grey, this novel, without the crimson and yellow and here and there a streak of rose, of some of Dostoevsky's later novels, but how finely is it spun in its varying shades. All through it is suffused and irradiated by the gentleness and pity of the author. What a dear old man he has made of this half crazy drunkard. It is a very humble pity, whose pearly light illumines these pages, a pity neither of the artist, nor of the moralist, but of the fellow-sinner.

And indeed, many years before he wrote it, Dostoevsky had begun already his life-long struggle with poverty, with that squalid privation and misery which the old clerk hid with tremulous courage from his adored, half starved seamstress.

"Hats and boots" says one of his biographers, "seem to have haunted for decades the sombre psychologist, who was to sound the deepest plummets of the human soul, to unravel its last evasive windings, to read pityingly the deprecating grimace of fear behind the last mask of all." ¹⁾

¹⁾ J. A. T. Lloyd, *A Great Russian Realist*.

But worse things than hats and boots, worse things than hunger even, he had to contend with. Greater enemies were his own moodiness, his extreme sensibility, his insatiable passions, the instability of his conduct. Reason always played a rather subordinate rôle in the constitution of this great man and the success of *Poor Folk* seems to have made him lose his balance for a time.

"All the Minnas, Claras, Mariannas, etc. have got amazingly pretty", he writes in these days, "but cost a lot of money. Turgenev and Bielinsky lately gave me a talking-to about my disorderly way of life. Those fellows really don't know how they can best prove their affection — they are all in love with me".

And in another letter: "I do live in a very disorderly way, and that's the truth! . . . My health is utterly shattered. I am neurotic, and dread low fever. I am so dissolute that I simply can't live decently any more . . ."

However, he succeeded in later years to live decently enough. And if his life was spoiled, especially in those younger years, because he was not the master but the slave of his passions, there was also a quite uncommon kindness, an inexhaustible fund of pity and generosity in him, which accounts to a great extent for his irregularities.

We shall not follow him in the details of his further life, but there's one great event of which we have to say a few words: his banishment to Siberia.

About 1848 some groups for the study of social and political questions had formed themselves in Petersburg. Dostoevsky belonged to one of them and read there aloud a more or less revolutionary letter from the great critic Bielinsky to Gogol. It became the most incriminating part of his indictment when one day the police swooped down on their circle. After having passed more than half a year in the Petropaulovsky fortress, he, with several others of the so-called Petrachevtsy, was sent to the Semyonovski Square in order to have the death sentence read over him. At the last moment it was commuted to hard labour in the Siberian prisons.

A more unjust sentence was seldom pronounced, though the annals of Tsarist judicature are among the most infamous in history. There was not much of the political reformer in Dostoevsky and certainly nothing of the rebel.

The view of life expressed by Makar Dievushkin in *Poor Folk* was in substance not so very different from the view of life of Dostoevsky himself and would remain the foundation and strength of it through stress and storm:

"Our lots in life", says the good old man, "are apportioned by the Almighty according to our human deserts. To such a one He assigns a life in a general's epaulets or as to a privy councillor, — to such a one, I say, He assigns a life of command; — whereas to another one He allots only a life of un murmuring toil and suffering. These things are calculated according to a man's *capacity*. One man may be capable of one thing, and another of another, and their several capacities are ordered by the Lord God himself".

What a hell this Siberian prison must have been to him, is clear enough from the simple description of his outside appearance, here quoted from the *Memoranda of Martyanov, at the House of the Dead*. "His hard fate had, as it were, turned him to stone. He seemed dull, awkward, and was always taciturn. On his pale, worn, ashen face, which was freckled with dark-red spots, one never saw a smile; he opened his lips only to utter curt, disconnected remarks about his work . . ."

He himself wrote about these years: "I look upon these four years as a time of living burial. I was put in a coffin. The suffering was inexpressible and incessant, because every hour, every minute weighed down my spirits like a millstone".

If Dostoevsky had possessed the rebellious temperament of Tom Paine or Lenin, of Shelley or Multatuli, this unjust sentence, these dark and cruel years in a filthy Siberian prison would have filled him with a wild desire for liberty, an immense longing to use all his capacities, all his strength, with unfettered hands, in the fight with despotism and superstition, but Dostoevsky had not the rebellious, but the submissive temperament, the religious temperament, if we use religious in its more orthodox signification, with its call to obedience and humility. A humility going so far as to make Soloviev call him "a man who has been divested of his ego through humility". What would have made ardent revolutionaries of others, only deepened and strengthened in him the sense of our general unworthiness, and the need to accept life and its vicissitudes in a meek and humble spirit. In Russia this meant in the first place unconditional obedience to the higher powers of State and Church.

For three years his only book was the Bible and the constant reading of this book awakened and fortified in him that Christian spirit, always latent in his nature, which, modified by his nationalism, made him dream his great and mighty dreams of a Holy Russia, the Saviour of degenerated Europe.

What certainly is most remarkable and admirable in this man is his power of resignation and endurance. "It is impossible" says one of his friends, "to imagine circumstances, which would have crushed him."

It strikes one as a miracle how, time after time, he rose from his misfortunes and failures, renovated and undaunted, how he kept renewing the struggle with a mind widened in its knowledge and daring. In this excessive vitality, this wonderiul power of endurance, he seems to be typical of the Muscovite people, full of obscure atavism, the inheritance of centuries of suffering. His mind survived the four abominable years of Siberian prison-life; his illness, epilepsy, exhausted as it left him for a time, never interfered for more than a short period with his creative powers; his poverty and pressing money difficulties during various periods of his life, enough to rob most men of all energy, only seemed to act as a stimulus to his unconquerable genius; all the handicaps that would have sapped and annihilated the working power of writers not gifted with his extraordinary toughness and vitality, could not hinder him from the production of a series of masterpieces ranging from *Poor Folk* to *The Brothers Karamazov*.

Siberia supplied the novelist with the raw material for two books. *Injury and Insult* is part of his own life-story during the period that followed his prisonlife when for some years he served, first as a common soldier and later as an officer in the Siberian army. It contains the story of that romance in which Dostoevsky had done everything in his power to help another man to marry the woman whom he himself loved but who in the end married himself. It was a case of unexampled, for most people almost unimaginable unselfishness.

Buried Alive (also called *The House of the Dead*) gives us the experience of his prisonlife, a sincere and striking record not only of physical endurance and psychical suffering, but also of the way, in which this great artist observed the wrecks of human society with whom he was thrown together. It has been called a "treatise on criminal psychology", but it transcends most books of that class by its spirit of understanding and sympathy.

Discharged from the military service, Dostoevsky returned to St. Petersburg where he published his above mentioned books. That was about 1861. In 1862 we find him abroad where he remained for a couple of years and many of his letters date from this period. Endless rows of figures and

accounts, interspersed with desperate entreaties for help, fill most of these communications from foreign countries. It is one long martyrology.

"The roulette had regained its old spell over him", says one of his biographers "and it seems as though this unfortunate man who had endured so much through no fault of his, must ceaselessly endure every phase of humiliation by reason of his own weakness."

Driven by such circumstances he often had to work under exceeding pressure. "Many a time," he confesses himself, "the beginning of a chapter of a novel was already at the printer's and being set up while the end was still in my brain and had to be ready without fail next day. Work out of sheer want has crushed and eaten me up."

And yet this man of many contradictions, as full of contradictions as most of the characters of his novels, and as human beings in general are, had the greatest feeling of responsibility regarding his own work. What I tell the reader here of his life is my impression of preponderating influences and views in that life, not *all* his life. He was a man of strong impulses and great feelings, but also of a searching and splendid mind; he was a Christian, but also a doubter and his doubts accompanied him to the end of his days; he was Russian to the core, but he had a much better knowledge and appreciation of European literature than Tolstoy; he ascended the greatest spiritual heights, but he was constantly dragged down to a lower plane and sometimes to very low depths; he was the novelist of pity but he could be very cruel in his vivisection of the human mind; he was a patriotic and orthodox Russian and his vision was to some extent, in some directions to a great extent, limited by the sphere marked by these qualifications, yet his work in psychology and morals is of the greatest value for all mankind.

And so, in this case, if his way of working was in a great measure that of the literary hack, the proofs are not failing that he was very conscientious about the general tenor and value of his books.

About *Crime and Punishment* he once said: "At the end of November much was written and ready, but I burned it all and began afresh."

His book *The Gambler* was a result of that first fateful journey on the Continent — the second was of no happier kind, — but a much better-known and superior work was soon to follow. It was *Crime and Punishment*. The masterly treatment of the inner workings of the mind of Raskolnikov, the murderer, make it a book which famous criminologists have found most helpful in their studies, but the profound analysis of suffering, which the author combines with this exposition of criminal motives, give it a much wider, more general interest. Raskolnikov, this strange hero, who became a murderer mainly through intellectual speculation and the pride of his intelligence, and Sonia, the unfortunate, who is also the redeemer, a symbol of endurance and belief, will live for ever as great literary figures.

The book had a great success, but peace had not come yet for Dostoevsky — did it ever come except at luminous intervals to his tormented mind? — and another period of exile in Western Europe to which he had taken flight from the pressure of his debts, followed from 1867 to 1871, four long, for Dostoevsky interminable, years. But then, in 1871 we find him settled again at St. Petersburg, now for good, and circumstances, at last, become more favourable. For this he has to thank his young wife, Anna Grigorovna, who besides being a most devoted wife, proved herself a capable business woman. A helpmate in the best sense of the word.

In the meantime, however, two of his most famous books have been published: *The Idiot* and *Demons*. In *The Idiot* he has embodied most

directly his personal and national ideal, his faith in Russia, the Russian people and the Russian God. It is full of personal reminiscences. His own illness, epilepsy, is also the illness of Prince Myshkine, the hero, and the details of this illness are given with the accuracy of painful experience. This so-called "sacred illness" has had a remarkable effect on the writer's life and influenced to a great extent his artistic creations and philosophic speculations. Prince Myshkine is the ideal Russian as Dostoevsky understood him and he makes the prince a touchstone of character in others. He is not only good in himself but appeals to all good qualities or sides in other human beings.

Demons, the novel that followed, great as it is as another testimony to Dostoevsky's artistic and creative powers, his powers of composition and representation, is of a less satisfactory, in any case more controversial, nature in other respects. One may find it convincing enough in its several personages, seen separately or from the writer's standpoint in life — Dostoevsky's figures have always life and unity in them and we may not ask more from the novelist as a novelist. But the impression it leaves of the Nihilist and progressive movement in Russia, its aims and ideals during some of its fiercest and most troublous days, is very one-sided. It is more a caricature than a true representation of the motives actuating the men and women then at work — mostly in an underground way, and it could not be otherwise — for the political regeneration of their country. At a time when they were trying to secure a minimum of political freedom and democratic justice, Dostoevsky insisted on enlarging upon the spiritual dangers of liberty without alluding for one minute to its benefits, he painted in glowing colours the negative side and the excesses of the new movement without doing a semblance of justice to its positive and liberating qualities.

It was in harmony with his general view of life, but was it very helpful to his country?

One of the most remarkable of the smaller novels, published by Dostoevsky in these latter years, especially from the autobiographical point of view, is *The Underground Spirit*. Like *The Idiot* and other novels it contains many opinions, reflections, experiences, which one may take to be of a personal nature. Ordinov, the self-tormented hero of these pages, is used by the author for a study in introspection, in which he probes the very depths of his own conscience. The following lines are probably not unconnected with that awful period of hypochondria which the writer passed through during the period preceding his exile to Siberia.

"At times I suddenly plunged into a sombre subterranean, despicable debauchery or semi-debauchery. My squalid passions were keen, glowing with morbid irritability. The outbursts were hysterical, accompanied by tears and convulsions of remorse. Bitterness boiled in me. I felt an unwholesome thirst for violent moral contrasts, and so demeaned myself to animality. I indulged in it by night, secretly, fearfully, foully, with a shame that never left me, even at the most degrading moments. I carried in my soul the love of secretiveness; I was terribly afraid that I should be seen, met, recognised."

Reading this, one begins to understand why he could say once, that he was better in mind and body for his exile in Siberia, in spite of the fact that it was there that he had developed definite epilepsy.

But a work of far more importance for the world than *The Underground Spirit* is the last great book he left us: *The Brothers Karamazov*. In this powerful novel, which is rightly considered as the crown on his labours, every side of Dostoevsky's nature reveals itself. It is not a very attractive family, these

Karamazovs — in fact, I feel more at home amongst the Forsytes, though these too have their faults, their hard-hearted English qualities — it is not an attractive family, this sordid father, ferocious in his sensualism, who can say to his sons: "Ha, my children, my little pigs, for me there never was such a thing as a woman to be let alone; that's my creed, if you understand it? No, you can't understand it, your veins are still full of milk; you haven't completely broken your shell yet".

Such a father and his four sons form the principal figures of what is called the central work of Dostoevsky, a work which the great Russian critic Merezhkovsky in his admirable study *Tolstoy and Dostoevsky* qualifies as follows: "We see the whole spectrum of love in all its blended shades and transformations, in its most mysterious, acute and morbid sinuosities. Remarkable is the inevitable blood-bond between the monster Smerdiakov, Ivan "who fought with God", the cruel sensualist Dmitri, who seemed as if stung by a gadfly, the stainless cherub, Alesha, and their father according to the flesh, the outcast Fedor Karamazov. Equally remarkable is the bond between them and their father in the spirit, Dostoevsky himself. He would have disowned this family, perhaps, before men, but not before his own conscience, before God

It is perhaps only after a more intimate acquaintance that one can gauge in their true inwardness, the character, merit and greatness of this representation of vice and virtue. But even at a first reading Dostoevsky's Karamazovs will strike one as having something titanic in their make-up, one feels the hand of a great and impassioned creator behind them. Between the animal and the mystic, between the north and the south-pole, between hell and heaven they show us such a panorama of human qualities, moving in the most divergent directions, such a blend of idealism and cynicism and they show it us in such a vigorous and dramatic manner, with such a fulness of life, as make this book of a unique character in the world's literature.

And one understands why Dostoevsky has been called *the greatest interpreter* of the Russian soul.

His books do not excel in beauty of form and the marvels of creative power and human insight, of ethical and psychological wisdom, which they contain, are scattered along miles of often wearisome travelling. This characteristic is bound up with the whole nature and philosophy of life of Dostoevsky. For the latter seems to imply the renunciation of one's personality and talents, of one's faculties and abilities, for the common good. Or, if this is putting the case in too extreme a way, that philosophy of life certainly does not agree with the slow and painful elaboration of the poetical sentence and great art in general. This want of art may more seriously endanger Dostoevsky's reputation amongst future generations than amongst the present in which Beauty has lost her queenship. One of her noblest characteristics is *concentration* and at some far-away time, when mankind may have come to the conclusion that its time is getting too precious for novels of more than a thousand pages, the Sonnets of Rossetti — so delightful in their condensed magnificence — may be eagerly read still, and the novels of Dostoevsky — so terrifying in their bulky dispersion — relegated to some dusty bookshelf.

But we shall not know that time, so need not worry about it.

We said Dostoevsky has been called the greatest interpreter of the Russian soul and, certainly, he is the delineator of that soul in its width and expansiveness, its generosity and its cruelty, its overflowing passions, its

impulsiveness, its convulsive changes from action to apathy, from apathy to action. But though he may be said to represent in these and other qualities the majority of his countrymen, I do not think he would be called a true mouthpiece by or for that section which in thought and life is more strongly related to the Western mind, the reforming or revolutionary section. Reforming or revolutionary — the two qualifications were very much the same in Dostoevsky's days and mostly a question of temperament; one could not reform without revolution. And this side of life separates him with a wide gulf from those leading Russian revolutionaries which we have seen at work in our own day. Undoubtedly he has a great deal in common even with them — our space does not allow us to explore his relation to the Revolution here to greater depths — but in two important points his view of life and appreciation of human qualities differs widely from theirs. The strongest characteristic of such men as Lenin and Trotsky, the characteristic, which made them accomplish the in most eyes impossible, the characteristic which gave them their extraordinary and amazing influence over their countrymen, which has enabled them to keep the reins of the Russian state in their hands during nearly five years of conflicts without end, of storms and calamities, any separate one of which would have overturned a western government, their strongest characteristic is *Willpower* and *Conscious Thought*, willpower resting on conscious thought. Whatever may have been the motives of the masses which flocked to their standards in the turbulent days of 1917, willpower and conscious thought, their astonishing and convinced power of will and their boundless intellectual energy, applied to the extraordinary circumstances of the time, enabled them to reshape the present and future of Russia. They may be wrong and they may fail — to some extent they certainly will; once on their way, such movements are by their inner tension generally driven far beyond their limits of practicability — but this would not make their efforts of less interest, this would not make Human Will and Human Reason less important factors in the remodelling and renewing of the World.

There is much virtue in obedience and humility, much virtue in submission to what we consider the Will of God. It is only when we come to consider and weigh what the Will of God is (not the Christian, nor the Russian, but the Universal God) that we differ from Dostoevsky. Humility, love, pity, compassion, qualities of which he is the great exponent in his books, these forces of the unconscious mind form certainly the most essential material, the most necessary means of cementation in any and every society of human beings, and they have been lacking too much in all the larger societies of the past. The great and lasting merit of Dostoevsky's books is to impress their worth, their superior worth, once more, upon our minds. But hardly less necessary for the building up of the society of the future, and therewith of our own being, is another power: Reason, conscious, well-directed reason. Unfortunately reason is in this great novelist's books mostly used as a disturber of the peace or to defeat itself. Intellect and vanity, intellect and wickedness are too often synonyms in his books.

The last terrible years of war and chaos have shown us, as it was never shown before, how much mis-directed, destructive action there is in present-day mankind. But it makes the need and value of well-directed action, thoughtful, conscientious action all the greater.

Obsessed by the soul as he was, Dostoevsky underestimated the value and force of these more material and external workings of human society

on which the soul in its instincts and longings and presentiments to such a great extent depends, and by which it is constantly modified and reshaped. Man in society is a very different being from man alone.

Neither Shelley nor Dostoevsky saw society in *evolution*. Shelley revolted against the evils to which mankind was heir and which he saw encouraged and upheld by the religious and moral beliefs and superstitions of his days. But he did not see that these beliefs and superstitions had grown with men's minds and expressed both their strength and weakness, all the truth and error they had learnt from many ages of experience. The gulf between his dreams and reality he could only traverse by an arbitrary leap of the imagination. So, feeling himself powerless to alter man as he was, he took flight out of the harshness and cruelty of this world present to our senses and created his fairer visions of a happier mankind in a world of his own.

Dostoevsky kept nearer home, but I do not see that he was sufficiently convinced of the intimate and continuous connection between psychic and physical forces in their interpenetration and reciprocate effect, of the deep-going influences of economic conditions and social environment on our moral attitude and actions, of slums and want and ugliness and dirt, and their inevitable results in the deformities of the human mind and soul. They are in his books, these material powers and influences, rather too much of them in their evil aspects, but they are not there in their logical sequences, in their true *social* colours and connections. His changes of mind and heart are not dependent on that slow and for the more artistic and imaginative mind wearisome, process, that gradual, step-by-step, improvement in and by material circumstances, judged rightly so important by the modern scientific mind. Because both, the heart and the body, the attitude of the mind and its external envelopment, are bound up in a thousand ways, bound up in the constant intercourse of the day and the hour and the moment. His changes of heart are always more or less of a sensational, lightning nature, they happen in an unconscious, spontaneous, mystic way; it is not our common world of labour and effort, of order and reason in which his figures move, it is a world of impulses and passions, of excesses and extremes, of hallucinations more than of reality. Yet, though the sudden transformation of man, and to some extent of society, though conversion, regeneration, is of course a psychical possibility, the main development of both, man and society, is more to be found in that gradual intercourse, with improved conditions, between body and soul, between matter and mind, between institutions and the community, than in these sudden and rare electric changes. Reason and Labour, the agents of our daily and communal life, work much slower but their fruits are more permanent.

That fresh air and proper food are as necessary for the cure of crime as sermons and exhortations or the visions of a prophet, in any case that the latter are valueless without the former, does not strike us as obvious from Dostoevsky's books. On the contrary, fresh air and proper food seem to be rather negligible influences in his philosophy of life, in which the mind takes a rather independent attitude in its relation to the body. Notwithstanding his realism, so profound and magnificent in his treatment of individual, mostly pathological cases, reflections mostly of his own inner-life, he is a sentimentalist, a sensationalist in his general attitude towards society and its workings. He does not give its due to that great and preponderating cause of human actions in civilised life: our social environment and the thoughts and actions engendered thereby. There has been, there is still, a tendency amongst socialists and reformers to give to these external, to a

great extent material and economic, factors an excessive, a far too exclusive value in the progress of mankind, but the tendency to excess in Dostoevsky is all the other way. It lifts our humanity out of its material framework into the thin and unreal air of pure mind.

His social psychology is vitiated by this one-sidedness. The difference between men, as it expresses itself in the battle of life, is not so much that between saints and criminals or between intellectuals and mystics, as that between the grasping, acquisitive and the generous, creative mind, between predatory egoists and their victims, between those living in riotous wealth and those that are starved and stunted. These categories and those of Dostoevsky overlap each other at many points and to a considerable extent, but there remains a very great difference between them for all practical purposes of politics and social legislation.

But one-sided as Dostoevsky's view of life seems to me, the errors of a one-sided intellectualism, an intellectualism that sneers at love and charity, an intellectualism that thinks it can reform the world by unadulterated logic, such errors are also apparent enough. That he has drawn our attention in such a forceful way to the shallows and shoals in these waters of intellectualism will not be among the least of the great merits of his novels. The danger of his viewpoint and way of representation is that he may lead us away from the road of social improvement, which is at the best a slow and difficult road, thickset with hardships and disappointments, and make us sit down in passivity, hoping against hope on some sudden and spontaneous transformation of the individual man.

The truth is that our science, our environment, our educational and social institutions, our collective organisation and efforts have helped to mould and form the past generations, that among the forces which have had the greatest influence on the progress of man has been the conscious following in these matters of what appeared to the living generation as *rational ideals* in the relations with their fellow men. All along the endless path and process of human growth these ideals have unfolded themselves, however imperfectly, in the more external ways of laws and institutions.

If Dostoevsky acknowledges progress, it is not in the restless effort, the unceasing labour of the human mind, it is in some sudden, dramatic, accidental change of the human heart. Not to man's continuous longing and searching for knowledge and light, his eagerness and inquisitiveness, his desire for improvement of his own status and that of his fellowmen one would think that mankind had to thank its rise in stature and vision, but to the inexplicable ways of mysticism and regeneration.

We have long since gained the knowledge that kindness in the old individualist way is not sufficient, that we have to relay the *material* foundations of our society in a way which shall free human aspirations and human intercourse from the baneful influences, now keeping back and perverting the best and most generous intentions. That has to be done in a way in which science and reason play a very great part. Undoubtedly we shall never be able to do so without the love and pity, in which Dostoevsky sees the only hope and saving influence, but we repeat: the Sermon on the Mount is not sufficient. That love and pity has to be well directed, it has to know its proper sphere and limits and directions, it has to be translated in the practical work of customs and habits, of methods and organisation, of laws and institutions. It has to be supported by reason. Only so can we obtain that development of society which will

allow for the greatest development of the personality, its talents and capacities. Development, not renunciation, must be our aim.

* *

Neither Shelley nor Dostoevsky offer us a solution, in any way complete, of the problem which the future keeps putting before every thinking being, but then, no man will ever give us that solution except for some limited time and in a limited way. The solution that will serve us, has ultimately to be found by every individual for itself. And by every generation for itself.

Idealism and realism, pride and humility, rebellion and submission, feeling and reason, conscious will and unconscious thought, beauty and goodness, out of all these elements we have to construct our own road to heaven. But both Shelley and Dostoevsky have given us some lasting and brilliant contributions towards our own efforts in that direction, contributions which place them in a high rank as benefactors and heroes of the race.

Such men we must take as we find them. The pure and lofty idealism of Shelley's songs would have been impossible to him, if he had gone through the same deep straits of human infamy as Dostoevsky. The latter would not have been able to give us that arresting and powerful picture of the darker human passions and their struggle towards the light if his mind had dwelt amidst the golden mists and splendours of Shelley's uncompromising and radiant personality. Both are seers; a fierce and divine flame of missionary zeal burnt in both of them. Both are eminent and inimitable in their own different way which to a great extent *excludes* the other.

How very human, how magnificently human both are, and how different! Between the luminous heights of Shelley and the gloomy depths of Dostoevsky, heights and depths of which the boundaries are outside our ken, there seems to lie the infinity of human joys and sorrows, the infinity of human thoughts and feelings, the infinity of human passions and pity, the infinity of our beauty and our woe.

Amersfoort, May 1922.

J. DE GRUYTER.

Alastor or the Spirit of Solitude

Translated into Dutch

Preface

Thirteen years ago this translation was printed from a first draught, which I had not the leisure to copy or even to revise. It has now been carefully corrected, also in point of verse and diction.

Alastor is the first poem in which Shelley revealed his in-born fatality: his hunting after ideal beauty. He had been disappointed in trying to realize his social prospects, disappointed in his love, even — perhaps — already in his love for Mary, and so he saw his ideal as unattainable. He thought himself incurably ill, and so life seemed at an end: he could see it in its totality, like drowning people are said to see it in a flash of memory. He recognized himself as the solitary hunter after a vision, that, once seen, led him to his death.

The poem has two qualities: its impetuosity and its majesty. These together constitute its movement, which is the immediate expression of the poet's subject: the passionate and rapid and sacred life, that he wished to represent. Because in *Alastor* movement is the prime principle of imaginative expression, the poem lives by the concatenation of its parts, more than by the parts themselves, their feeling and their visibility. These two are of high value, but not of the highest: it is a fact, that some descriptions lack clearness, some thoughts comprehensibility, that many terms are vague or too often reiterated. But these deficiencies are of little moment: the connection of the parts, the movement makes up for them all. It is the strong flight of an exalted soul, overlooking the stream of its life.

As soon as this flight ceases, as soon as the poet ends his contemplation of *Alastor's* corpse, the song is finished. The strophe, beginning:

O for Medea's wondrous alchemy

does not belong to it. This line evokes a tone of almost morbid feeling, better known to Keats than to Shelley. Keats might have written it. The entire final strophe reflects a dark stagnation. It has not the highwinged connection of periods, which is Shelley's first element of clearness and comprehension. The thoughts, laden with allusion, move with difficulty. They are not the crowning end of the poem, but a reflective return upon its contents.

* * *

At the end of his life, the same Shelley who wrote *Alastor* — exactly the same — appears in *Epipsychidion*.

The beginning lines of this poem constitute a famous difficulty.

Sweet spirit! Sister of that orphan one,

Whose empire is the name thou weepest on —

These are the words, addressed to Emilia Viviani.

Well-known Shelley-students have tried to explain them. Richard Garnett was of opinion that "orphan one" had to be understood as "orphan sister" and that Mary Shelley was meant. Armin Kröder contradicted this and believed that the lines designated Shelley himself. A satisfactory explanation of the second line has, in my opinion, not been given.

I have sometimes thought: can it be that Shelley, by "that orphan one" understood *Alastor*?

Alastor represents the youth, seeking for a sister-soul; *Epipsychidion* celebrates the discovery of the sister-soul. Alastor was a "spirit" — Shelley calls him so. He was an "orphan spirit", for there was nobody to detain him when he left "his cold fireside and alienated home", in order to find strange truths. And he had a name that was, or expressed, his empire, namely solitude. "Alastor or the Spirit of Solitude" had been written by Shelley above this poem, not because this spirit led a solitary life, but because he was a creature of "self-centred seclusion", of in-born solitude. On this name, that images an empire, Emily wept; as it imaged also her claustral seclusion and imprisonment.

This explanation (like that of Garnett) makes plausible why Shelley speaks of "that orphan one", in the tone and with the terminology of one who refers to a person that is not he himself. At the same time it does not exclude the possibility of giving a symbolic sense to the word "orphan". He who has solitude born with him, feels himself naturally as without parents.

My supposition therefore appeared to me to enlighten more points than any other one. Nevertheless its truth is not proved and not provable. Perhaps it has no other value than that it instigates us to look at *Epipsychidion* in its relation to *Alastor*. That Alastor sought in vain what, six years later, Shelley believed to have found, may have caused the emotion out of which the new poem was born. It has really caused it.

I never thought before my death to see
Youth's vision thus made perfect.

This is the exclamation, with which, immediately after the four prefatory strophes, the poem begins. It evokes *Alastor*, and it contradicts it.

This mental act of Shelley's wakens immediately its counter-act in the reflection that he is married to Mary. When he wrote *Alastor*, Mary could not object against his affirming that she was not the unattainable ideal. But how now, he having discovered that the ideal was attainable, that it was incorporated in Emilia Viviani? His answer was the theory of love as multifarious.

Aware of this conflict, I find it extremely difficult to confide in data, which otherwise would be above suspicion. Garnett may have had his opinion from Mary. Kröder — afterwards de Bosis — bases his upon some Italian lines in Shelley's handwriting. But these declarations — partly supposed, partly vague and incomplete — coming from the interested parties, have only a relative value. The poem, considered as a part of Shelley's life, remains our best counsel. And when I consider it as such, I cannot separate it from *Alastor*. It is at once its continuation and its contradiction. *Alastor* had been Shelley's first poem, the first that he recognized as his own, the first in which his inmost soul revealed itself. The great event of six years later was the reawakening, under the influence of Emilia, of the poet of *Alastor*. His cry: "I never thought" — proves that he was conscious of this reawakening. Alastor and Emily were the two spirits, who, across his life and his marriage, reached hands. Would it be strange, if this alliance had been expressed in the beginning of *Epipsychidion*, and if so, in words that nobody could understand?

These are the reflections which may make it excusable that I consoled myself with a personal explanation. If afterwards it may appear that the enigma of these two verses has not been touched by it, I shall still have had the joy of reading *Epipsychidion* with the eyes of Alastor.

ALASTOR

OF DE GEEST VAN DE EENZAAMHEID

Lucht, aarde en zee, mij dierbre broederbond!
 Zoo in mijn ziel de almachtige Moeder stortte
 Een vleug maar van natuurlijk meegevoel,
 En liefde waarmee 'k uwe liefde loon';
 Zoo dauwige uchtend, geurge noen, en avond
 Met pronk-omstoete zonnenondergang,
 En 't tinklend zwijgen van de plechtige nacht;
 Zoo 't hol gezucht van herfst in 't dorre woud,
 En winters witte sneeuw en sterrige kronen
 Van ijs om 't grauwe gras en 't naakt geboomt;
 Zoo 't weeldrig hijgen van de Lent, haar eerste
 En zoete zoenen-aëm, me ooit dierbaar waren;
 Zoo vogel, klein insekt, zachtvaardig dier
 Ik nooit bewust gekrenkt heb, maar altijd
 Liefhad en koesterde als mijn maagschap; — dult,
 Beminde broedren, dan die lof en laat
 Me ook thans geen deel van de oude gunst ontgaan.

Moeder van dit onpeilbare heela!
 Begunstig mijn gewijde zang, want ik
 Minde u altijd en u alleen; ik nam
 Uw schaduw waar en 't donker van uw gang
 En mijn hart staart gedurig op het diep
 Van uw diepe geheimen. 'k Spreidde mij
 Een bed in 't knekelhuis op kisten, waar
 De Dood de aan u ontwonnen buiten telt,
 Hopend dat ik de onstilbre vragen stil
 Naar u en 't uwe, — een eenzaam geest, uw bô,
 Nopend dat hij 't verhaal mij overgeeft
 Van wat wij zijn. In stil, verlaten uur,
 Als nacht betooverd klinkt van eigen zwijgen,
 Mengde ik, als een bezeten alchimist
 Die 't leven zelf stelt op een donkre hoop
 — Wan-hopig —, gruwbre praat en vraag-gestaar
 Met mijn onschuldige lief, tot vreemd geweën
 Vereend met ademlooze kussen, schiep
 Zoodaange toover als de ontkrachte nacht
 Dwingt uw geheim te toonen, — en schoon nooit
 Ge uw innigst heiligdom ontsluiert, scheen
 Genoeg van nimmer mededeelbre droom,

Schemer-gedaante, diepe middag-peins
 In mij, zoodat ik nu volkomen klaar
 En roerloos, als een langvergeten lier
 Omhoog gehangen in de ledige dom
 Van tempel eenzaam en geheimnisvol,
 Uw aëm wacht, Groote Moeder, die mijn snaar
 Mag deinen doen met murmeling van de lucht,
 En golving van de wouden en de zee,
 Stem van bezielde wezens, zang-geweef
 Van nacht en dag, en 't diep hart van de mensch.

Er was een dichter wiens ontijdig graf
 Geen mensch-hand vroom-eerbiedig heeft gebouwd,
 Maar herfstwind-vlagen door zijn lijk bekoord,
 Hoopten een pyramide eroverheen
 Van blader-lijken in de wildernis.
 Lieflijke knaap — geen rouwend meisje hulde
 Met treurgebloemt of wijkrans van cypres
 De eenzame sponde van zijn eeuwge slaap: —
 Zachte, edelmoedige, dappre — een dwalend bard
 Aëmde om zijn donker lot geen zucht en zang.
 Hij leefde en stierf en zong in eenzaamheid.
 Vreemdingen weenden bij zijn hartstocht-toon,
 En maagden, als hij naamloos langs kwam, kwijnden,
 Naar zijn wilde oogen door verlangst verteerd.
 't Vuur van die zachte bollen brandt niet meer
 En Stilte, als ook verliefd op dat geluid,
 Sluit zijn muziek, nu stom, in ruige cel.

Gewijd vizioen en schittrend zilvren droom
 Voedden zijn kindertijd. Tafreel en klank
 Van de wijde aarde en de ommeegaande lucht
 Zonden zijn hart hem-dierste werkingen.
 Bronnen van godlijke wijsgeerigheid
 Vloten zijn dorstige lippen niet: al 't groote
 Of goede of lieflijke, uit eerwaard verleên
 Heilig als feit of fabel, voelde hij
 En kende 't. De eerste jeugd voorbij, weerhouden
 Door koude haard noch vreemd geworden thuis,
 Zocht hij in vreemde streken nieuw geheim.
 Menige woestijn en warrige wildernis
 Lokte zijn vreesloos gaan; hij wierf er zich
 Met stem zoo zoet, en oogen, van wild volk
 Zijn rust en maal. Natuurs geheimste tred

Volgde hij als haar schaduw, overal
 Waar de vulkaan, vuurrood, met brandend smook,
 Velden van sneeuw en rotstoppen van ijs
 Een hemel spant, of waar meren van teer
 Op zwart naaktpuntig eiland aldoor slaan
 Met loomig schuim, of waar verborgen grotten,
 Duister en ruig, windend de bronnen langs
 Van gif en aardvuur, ontoegankelijk
 Voor gierigheid of trots, hun sterrige daken
 Van diamant en goud uitwelfen boven
 Tallooze en ongemeten ruimten, rijk
 Aan zuilen van kristal en nissen, klaar
 Van paarl, en tronen: stralend chrysoliet.
 Noch had dat veld van weidscher majesteit
 Dan goud of steenen, 't wisslend hemeldak,
 Noch 't groen van de aard geringere aanspraak op
 Liefde en bewondring: lang verwijlde hij
 In onbewoonde dalen, had voor huis
 De wildernis: duiven en eekhoorns namen
 Hun bloedloos voedsel uit zijn veilige hand,
 Door 't zacht bedoelen van zijn blik gelokt;
 En de wilde antilooop die opschrikt, als
 Een dor blad ritselt in 't gestruik, hield even
 De bloode stappen in, ziende op een vorm
 Bevalliger dan haar eigne.

In ver gedwaal

Hooge gedachten volgend, zocht zijn voet
 De ontzachtbre puinen van een doode tijd:
 Athene en Tyrus, Baalbec, 't woeste veld
 Waar stond Jeruzalem, gezonken torens
 Van Babylon, de eeuwige pyramiden,
 Memphis en Thebe en zooveel zeldzaams als
 Gebeeldhouwd op albasten obelisk,
 Of jaspis-tombe of lang-verminkte sfinx
 Donker Ethiopië in haar zandige heuvels
 Verbergt. Tusschen de in gruis gestorte tempels,
 Reusachtige zuilen, wilde afbeeldselen
 Van meer dan mensch, waar marmren demons waken
 Bij 't koopren zodiacs-geheim, en dooden
 't Stom denken hangen langs de stomme wand,
 Draalde hij, broedende op gedachtnisteevens
 Van 's werelds jeugd, brandende dagen lang
 Dat spraakloos volk beturend; noch, wen maan

't Geheimvol ruim met schaduwen bedreef,
 Staakte die taak hij, maar betuurde aldoor
 En tuurde, tot zijn ledige geest een zin
 Doorbliksemde als inblazing sterk: hij zag
 Trillen 't geboortgeheim van de aardsche tijd.

Zijn voedsel bracht hem een Araber-maagd,
 Haar daaglijksch aandeel, uit haar vaders tent,
 En spreidde tot zijn bed haar mat, en sloop
 Van rust en plichten om hem nategaan:
 Verliefd, maar vol ontzag niet wagende
 Van min te spreken: waakte als hij 's nachts sliep,
 Slaaploos zijzelf, om naar zijn mond te zien
 In slaap half open, waar zijn adem kalm
 Rees in onschuldige droomen: 't roode licht
 Bleekte de bleeke maan, als haar koud huis,
 Angstig en mat en hijgend, zij hervond.

De Dichter, zwervend, heel Arabië door,
 Perzië en de woeste Carmaniaansche streek,
 Over de hooge bergen die uit hollen
 Van ijs d'Indus en Oxus nederstorten,
 Wandelde vreugdvol, opgetogen, voort.
 Tot in het dal van Cashmir, binnen in
 Zijn stilste del, waar geurge planten onder
 De holle rots een wild prieel omwinden
 Neven een flonkrend beekje, hij vermoeid
 Zijn leden strekte. Een vizioen beving
 Zijn slaap, droom van verwachting, die nog nooit
 Zijn wang deed blozen. Een gesluierd meisje
 Zat naast hem, sprak tot hem, zacht en als plechtig.
 Haar stem geleek die van zijn eigen ziel
 In een gedachten-kalmte; haar geluid
 Een lang muziek-geweef van wind en stroom,
 Hield zijn diepst wezen in een web van veel-
 Kleurige draden en tint-wisslend licht.
 Haar onderwerp was kennis, waarheid, deugd,
 Van hemelsch vrijzijn de verheven hoop,
 Gedachten hem meest lief, en poëzie,
 Poëet zijzelf. De plechtige stemming van
 Haar reine geest ontstak door heel haar lijf
 Een vuur dat doorscheen, wilde maten hief ze
 Met stem, verstikt in sidderend gesnik,
 Bedwongen door haar pathos: naakte handen

Alleen, bewogen, slaand van vreemde harp
 Vreemde muziek, en in hun aadren-tak
 Sprak 't bloed zijn onuitsprekelijk verhaal.
 Het kloppen van haar hart was hoorbaar tijdens
 De pauzen in haar spel, terwijl haar adem
 Heviglijk in akkoord klonk met die vlagen
 Van tusschenpoozige zang. Zij rees opeens
 Alsof haar hart de last die uitborst, droeg
 Met ongeduld: hij wendde op dat geluid
 En zag bij 't warm licht van haar eigen leven
 Haar lijf dat gloeide onder de leenge sluier
 Van winde-weefsel, de opene armen bloot,
 De donkre lokken drijvende op de nacht,
 Haar buigende oogen stralend, mond ontsloten,
 Gereikt en bleek, en heftig siddrende.
 Zijn sterk hart zonk en kwijnde in overmaat
 Van liefde. 't Schokkend lichaam hief hij, hield
 Zijn stokkende adem in, wenschte in zijn armen
 Haar borst die hijgde: — zij deinsde even weg;
 Toen, zwichtend voor de onteugelbare vreugd,
 Met waanzinszwaai en korte aëmlooze kreet
 Omving zijn lijf ze in armen van damp.
 Zijn duizlende oogen zwart omsluierd, nam
 Nacht het vizioen op en verzwolg het: slaap,
 Een duistre vloed met kort weerhouden loop,
 Rolde zijn golf weer door zijn ledig brein.

De schok hem wekkend schrok hij uit zijn droom.
 't Koud-witte morgenlicht, de blauwe maan
 Laag in het westen, heuvels kleurig-klaar,
 Het duidelijk dal en 't onbewoonde bosch
 Spreidden rondom hem waar hij stond. Hoe vloden
 De hemeltinten die eerst gisternacht
 Zijn grot bespanden? 't Slaapwekkend geluid,
 't Geheimnis en de majesteit van de Aard,
 De vreugde, 't opgetoogne? Zijn moede oogen
 Staren op 't leeg tooneel zoo leeg van blik
 Als de zee-maan staart op de maan omhoog.
 De geest van zoete mensch-liefde beschoor
 Een nachtgezicht aan hem die tot die tijd
 Haar kostbre gaven smaadde. Heftig volgt hij
 Buiten het droomenrijk die schim die vliedt;
 En springt de grenzen over. Laas! helaas!
 Voltrok zich lichaams-, aëm-, en ziele-mengling

Ooit zóó bedrieglijk? Weg, weg, eeuwig weg,
 In padenlooze hei van duistre slaap,
 Dat schoone wezen! Leidt doods donkre poort
 Naar uw geheimnisvolle paradijs,
 O slaap? Voert flonkerboog in regenwolken
 En hangend bergland onder 't effen meer,
 Alleenig naar een zwart en waatrig diep,
 Terwijl doods blauw gewelf, walglijk bedampt,
 Waar iedre schim die rijst uit rottend graf
 Zijn dood oog bergt voor de verfoeide dag,
 Zal leiden, Slaap, naar uw verruklijk rijk?
 Die twijfel overstroomde als vloed zijn hart.
 De onzadigbare hoop ontwaakte en stak
 Zijn brein als was ze wanhoop.

Daglang hield

De dichter woordlooze gemeenschap met
 Zijn stille ziel. De hartstocht kwam bij nacht
 — De felle geest van een verstoorde droom —
 En schudde hem uit zijn slaap en leidde 'm uit
 In 't duister. Als een aadlaar die, gegrepen
 In ringen van de groene slang, haar borst
 Van 't gif voelt branden en zich voorwaarts stort
 Door nacht en dag, door storm en kalmte en wolk,
 Dol-duizelig van doodsnoed: blinde vlucht
 Over de wijde luchtwoestijn: zóó jachtend
 Voor schitter-schaduw van die minnige droom,
 Onder 't koud blikken van de nare nacht,
 Door warrige poelen, diepe hole-kloven,
 De slang in 't maanlicht schrikkend door zijn voet,
 Vlood hij. De roode zon daagde op zijn vlucht
 En wierp het spotlicht van haar levenskleuren
 Over zijn doodswang. Verder liep hij, tot
 Aornos bouw gezien van Petra's steilt
 Gelijk een wolk hong op de lage kim;
 Door Balk, en waar de halfvergane tomben
 Van Parthen-koningen op iedre wind
 Hun dunnend stof verstrooiden. Verder liep hij
 Verdwaasd, een moeizame woestijn van uren
 En dagen, binnen in zich 't broedend leed
 Dat teerde op zijn versmeulde levensvlam.
 Vermagerd was hij nu; zijn wapprend haar,
 Verdord door herfst van vreemde smarten, zong
 Rouwklachten in de wind; zijn matte hand

Hing als dood been in zijn verdroogde huid.
 Leven, en gloed die het verteerde, scheen
 Als in fornuis verborgen brandende,
 Alleen uit zijn donkre oogen. Hutbewoners,
 Menschlievend in zijn menschlijke behoeften
 Voorziende, zagen wondrend met ontzag
 Hun snelle gast. De bergbewoner, die
 Zijn spookgestalte aan duizlingwekkende afgrond
 Op eens zag staan, dacht dat de Windgeest zelf
 Met bliksemoogen, hijgende adem, voet
 Die op de sneeuw geen spoor liet, van zijn vaart
 Verpoosde: kindren borgen als hij kwam
 't Ontdaan gezichtjen in hun moeders kleed,
 Beängst door 't glariën van die wilde blik,
 Waarvan 't vreemd licht in meenge laatre droom
 Hen plaagde; jonge meisjes echter, door
 Natuur geleerd, begrepen half het leed
 Dat hem verteerde, noemden — valsche troost —
 Hem broer en vriend, drukten zijn bleeke hand
 Bij 't afscheid, zagen, vaag door tranen, 't pad
 Waarlangs hij heenging van hun vaders deur.

Hij poosde op 't laatst aan het Chorasmisch strand, —
 Eenzaam en wijd, zwaarmoedige woestijn
 Van moer en veen. Een innige aandrift drong
 Zijn voet naar de oever van de zee. Een zwaan
 Stond tusschen 't riet nabij een trage stroom,
 Rees bij zijn naadring, en met krachtige vleugels
 Stijgend ten hemel, boog zijn heldre vlucht hij
 Hoog over het onmeetlijk vasteland.
 Zijn oogen volgden hem: „Gij hebt een thuis,
 Gij schoone vogel; gij reist naar uw thuis;
 Daar zal uw zoete maat haar donzige nek
 Om de uwe slingren en uw weêrkomst vieren
 Met oogen glanzend van hun diepe vreugd.
 En wat ben ik dat ik hier dralen blijf,
 Met stem veel zoeter dan uw stervens-toon,
 Met weidscher geest dan de uwe, en lijf geschikter
 Tot schoonheid, heerlijkste vermogens spillend
 Aan doove lucht, aan een blinde aarde, en hemel
 Die op mijn mijmren zwijgt?” Een sombre glimlach
 Van hoop die wanhoopt plooit zijn trillende mond.
 Want slaap, dat wist hij, hield ontfermingloos
 't Kostbre bezit, en stille dood, misschien

Trouwloos als slaap, bood schaduw-lokaas aan,
 't Eigen vreemd schoon hoonend met twijfellach.

Verschrikt door zijn gedachten, zag hij op.
 Geen schoone duivel was nabij, geen klank
 Of beeld ontzette 'm dan in de eigen geest.
 Een kleine sloep die de oever nader dreef
 Trof 't ongedurig dwalen van zijn oog.
 Ze was al lang verlaten, want haar zijden
 Gaaptten van meenge scheur, haar kranke binten
 Bewogen met de golvingen van 't tij.
 De onrustige drang noopte hem scheep te gaan,
 De Dood te ontmoeten op de sombre zee.
 Die machtige Schaduw, wist hij toch, bemint
 De slijmige holen van 't bevolkte diep.
 De dag was blank en zonnig, zee en lucht
 Dronk zijn bezielend stralen, en de wind
 Woei krachtig van de kust, de golven zwartend.
 Zijn grage ziel gehoorzaam, sprong de zwerver
 De boot in, spreidde in top van naakte mast
 Zijn mantel uit en zat dan eenzaam neer.
 De boot schoot over 't water en hij voelde
 Haar gaan gelijk een wolflard voor de orkaan.

Als een die in een zilver vizioen
 En voor de vaart van geurge winden, drijft
 Op schitterende wolken, zoo gezwind
 Vlood langs het donkere en bewogen vlak
 Het krakend vaartuig. Warlwind zweepte 't voort,
 Met heftige vlaag en aanstortend geweld,
 Door 't kokend branden van het blanke schuim.
 De golven rezen. Hooger, hooger nog
 Wrongen hun nekken onder stormroê, woest,
 Als slangen worstlend in een giere-greep.
 Kalm, en genietende in het strijdgewoel
 Van golf stroomende op golf, en vlaag die zonk
 Op vlaag, en zwarte vloed op draaikolk stortend
 Met donkre en meesleurende loop, zat hij :
 Alsof hun geesten hem als dienaars waren
 Gegeven, dat ze 'm leidden tot het licht
 Van de oogen die hij liefhad, zat de Dichter,
 De hand aan 't roer. En de avond kwam nabij ;
 De stralen van zoneinde regenboogden
 Hoog in schuim-vlagige fonteingewelven

Die over 't woeste diep zijn pad bespanden;
 Schemering, langzaam stijgend uit het Oost,
 Wond in donkerder wrong haar lokkenvlechten
 Over Dags stralende oogen en blond voorhoofd.
 Nacht kwam, in 't sterrekleed. Aan iedre kant
 Stormden vreeslijker de veelvoudige
 Stroomen van de oceaansche bergwoestijn
 Ten strijd, dondrend in donkre drang, — ten spot
 Van 't kalme sterrenheir. De kleine boot
 Vlood nog de storm, vlood nog als schuimvlok vliedt
 Langs steile val van wintrige rivier;
 Poozend op 't scherp van de gespleten golf;
 Dan achterlatend de uitgeborsten vracht,
 Die, vallend, de oceaan doorgroef; — vlood veilig,
 Alsof die breekbre en uitgeteerde mensch
 Een god van de elementen was.

Te midnacht

Klaarde de maan: en zie! 't luchthoog getop
 Van Caucasus, dat ijze-spitsig blonk
 Onder 't gestarnt als zonlicht, en rondom
 Wiens holenvoet draaipeel en golleven
 Brekende en kolkend dat geen weerstand baat,
 Schallen en woën voortdurend. — Wie behoudt?
 De boot vlood voort, — de stroom joeg kokend door, —
 De rotsen sloten zwart, zaag-armig zich,
 De berg, doorkloofd, hing over op de zee,
 En haastiger nog, en meer dan menschlijk snel,
 Geheven op de boog van effen golf
 Jaagde de kleine boot. Een open hol
 Gaapte, en zijn smalle en diepe winding in,
 Gulpde de woelge zee. De boot vlood voort
 Haar vaart niet mindrend. „Vizioen en Liefde!”
 Kreet luid de dichter. „Nu heb ik gezien
 Het pad waarlangs gij heentooft. Slaap en Dood
 Scheiden ons nu niet lang!”

De boot doordreef

De winding van de grot. Het daglicht scheen
 Ten laatste op 't vloeien van die sombre stroom;
 Nu, waar de felste strijd van golf met golf
 Bedaart, over de onpeilbare rivier,
 Bewoog zij langzaam. Waar de berg, gespleten,
 Die zwarte diepten blootlei voor 't azuur,
 Eer nog 't reusachtige lichaam van de stroom

Viel tot de voet van Caucasus met klank
 Die de eeuwge rotsen schokte, — vulde hij
 Met ééne draaikolk heel die wijde kloof.
 Trede na treê rees 't cirklend water op,
 Draaiende met onmeetbre vaart, en spoelde
 Met haastige slag op slag de knoestige wortels
 Van machtge boomen die hun reuzenarmen
 In donker strekten. Middenin verbleef,
 Weerspieglend, maar misvormend iedre wolk,
 Een poel, bedrieglijk en vreeswekkend kalm.
 Aangevat door de opgaande stroom, gevoerd
 Tot duizlens snel, rond, rond, en nog weer rond,
 Rees trap na trap de straf-gespannen boot,
 Tot, op de top van de allerhoogste bocht,
 Waar door een oopning van die oeverrots
 De waatren óverstroomen en een plek
 Van glassige rust midden dat golfgevecht
 Ontstond, de hulk poost, siddrend. Zal zij zinken
 Waar de afgrond dreigt? Zal de aflopende stroom
 Van de onweerstaanbre kolk zich om haar slaan?
 Valt zij nu? — Wind, een dwaalsche vlaag van 't west,
 Hierheen geâdemd, vult het open zeil,
 En, kijk, met zacht bewegen, tusschen mos
 Van oeverglooïing, op een kalme stroom
 Onder een loovergrot, zeilt zij, en hoor!
 De gruwbre val vermengt zijn ver gedreun
 Met murmelkoelte in 't muzikale woud.
 Waar 't boomprieel terugwijkt en een kleine
 Ruimte van effen groen laat, wordt de kreek
 Gesloten door saamvattende oevers: gele
 Bloemen zien daar hun neergeslagen oogen
 Weerspiegeld in het kalm kristal. De deining
 Die de boot maakte brak die mijmertaak,
 Voorheen door dwaalsche vogel, dartle wind
 Of vallend speergras of hun eigen sterven
 Alleen, gestoord. De zwerfing voelde lust
 Hun schitter-kleur door 't dorre haar te winden,
 Maar dan beving verlatenheid opnieuw
 Zijn hart en hij weerhield zich. Nog had niet
 De sterke drang, die bleek uit blos, strakke oogen
 En schimmig lijf zijn dienst verricht: hij hing
 Over zijn leven, zooals bliksem wolk
 Doorstraalt, hangt eer hij dooft, eer vloeden
 Van donker hem omsluiten.

Middagzon

Scheen nu op 't bosch, één uitgestrekte groep
 Van mengel-schaduw welker bruine pracht
 Een eng dal overwelt. Geweldige hollen,
 Gehold in donkre voet van hooge rotsen
 Die spotten met zijn klacht, brullen en galmen.
 De takkenbogen en vervlochten blaren
 Weefden op 't pad een schemer, waar geleid
 Door liefde of droom, of god, of machtiger Dood,
 De Dichter in Natuurs bemindste wijk
 Zocht naar een plek, haar wieg, zijn graf. Al donkrer
 En donkrer hoopt schaduw op schaduw. De eik
 Breidt zijn reusachtge en knoestige armen uit,
 Omhelst de heldre beuk. De pyramiden
 Van hooge ceder, nederwelveend, vormen
 Plechtige koepels: onder ze en veel lager,
 Als wolken zwevende in een groene lucht,
 Hangen de esch en de accacia, drijvende
 Bevend en bleek. Rustlooze slangen lijkend
 In huid van vuur en kleurboog, kronklen kruipers
 Besterd met tienduizenden bloesems, rond
 De grijze stammen, en als kinderoogen
 Met lief bedoel en speelsche onschuldige list
 Om 't hart van wie hen liefheeft stralen slingren,
 Omranken deze de gehuwde twijgen,
 Hun innige bond nog nauwend; bladerweefsels
 Maken een net van de diep blauwe dag
 En 't middagheldre van de nacht, veelvormig
 Als tooverige wolken. Mossige zoomen
 Heuveln zich voort onder die welvingen
 Riekend met geurge kruiden, beoogd met bloeisels,
 Heel klein maar schoon. Een donkrer delling zendt
 Uit muskus-roos doorvlochten met jasmijn
 Een geur die ziel doet smelten en haar noodt
 Op lieflijker geheim. Door deze kloof
 Houden de tweeling-zusters Stilte en Schemer
 Hun middagwaak, zeilende door de schaadwen,
 Als dampgedaanten, vaag; verder, een wel
 Duister en glanzend vol doorschijnend nat,
 Die 't takkenweefsel van daarboven beeldt,
 En elk afhangend blad en iedere plek
 Van blauw dat door een tijdljke oopning springt;
 En anders niets wascht in dat spiegelvocht
 Zijn aanschijn, dan een onstandvastige ster,

Die schoon, als door beblaaarde tralie, blinkt,
 Of vogel, als gemaald, in 't maanlicht slapend,
 Of veelkleurig insekt beweegloos drijvend,
 Onbewust van de dag, eer nog zijn vleugels
 Hun pronk uitspreidden voor de middagblik.

Hier kwam de Dichter heen. Zijn oogen zagen
 't Eigen moe licht door de weerkaatste strepen
 Van zijn dun haar, duidelijk in donker diep
 Van 't stille water; zooals 't menschehart
 In droomen starende in het somber graf
 Daar zijn bedrieglijk beeld ziet. Hij vernam
 't Bewegen van de blaadren; 't gras dat sproot,
 En schrikte en blikte en beefde door 't besef
 Van ongewoon nabijzijn, en 't geluid
 Van de effen beek die uit geheime sprongen
 Van die donkre fontein rees. Naast hem scheen
 Een geest te staan — niet in een blinkend kleed
 Van schaduwig zilver of omlijstend licht,
 Ontleend aan wat de zichtbre wereld biedt,
 Bevallig, heerlijk of geheimnisvol; —
 Maar woudge golf en woordelooze bron,
 En vliet die springt, en avondsomerheid
 Die 't donker nog verdiepte, was de taal
 Waarin hij sprak met hem, alsof zij bei
 Alles wat was waren, alleen ... zijn blik
 Rijzende in diepste mijmring ... zag twee oogen,
 Ster-oogen, hangende in nacht van zijn denken,
 Die met azure' en klare glimlach hem
 Te wenken leken.

Volgzaam voor het licht

Dat in zijn ziel scheen, ging hij, houdende
 De winding van de del. Het vlietwater,
 Dartel en wild, vloeide door menig groen
 Ravijn onder het woud. Het viel somtijds
 Temidden 't mos met een hol murmelen,
 Donker en diep; dan danste 't op de gladde
 Steenen; als kindsheid lachte 't wjl het ging.
 Dan kroop het vlakten door in kalm gedwaal
 En kaatste elk gras en zinkend knopje weer
 Dat neerhing op zijn helderheid. — „O stroom! —
 Die komt uit ontoegankelijk-diepe bron,
 Waar wil uw geheimzinnige water heen?

Gij beeldt mijn leven. Uw doodstille nacht,
 Uw flikkrend golven, luide en holle kolk,
 Onvindbre bron en onnaspeurbre loop,
 Zijn elke in mij verbeeld: en 't wijde ruim
 En de ongemeten zee zeggen niet eer
 Wat slijmige grot, welke afgedwaalde wolk
 Uw waatren inhoudt, als 't heelal zegt, waar
 Mijn levende gedachten wonen, wijl
 Mijn bloedloos lijf op bloemen wegteert in
 De haastige wind."

Het gras langs, aan de zoom
 Van 't smalle water, ging hij; en hij prentte
 Op 't groene mos zijn voeten, bevend door
 Het schudden van zijn brandend lijf. Als een,
 Door vroolke waanzin opgestooten uit
 Zijn koortsbed, schreed hij; niet, gelijk zulk een,
 Het graf vergetend, waar, wanneer de vlam
 Van krachtlooze verrukking is gespild,
 Hij nederdaalt. Met snelle schreden liep hij
 In schaduw van geboomte, naast het vlieten
 Van 't wild babblende beekje voort; en nu
 Werden de plechtige boschswelvingen
 Vervangen door 't ééntintige avondlicht.
 Grauw rots keek uit schaarsch mos, en stiet op beek
 Die schuimend bruiste: sprietig rietgerank
 Wierp langs de ruige glooiing dunne schaduw,
 En enkel knoestge en oude sparretronken,
 Verweerd en kaal, grepen in wortelklauw
 De onwillige grond. Verandering kwam allengs,
 Toch ijslijk. Want, gelijk, als jaren gaan,
 Het voorhoofd rimpelt en 't haar dunner wordt
 En grijs; en waar spranklende dauwige oogen
 Schenen, steenbollen blinken; zoo, terwijl hij schreed,
 Verdwenen kleurge bloemen, warme schaduw
 Van groene holen, met hun geurge wind
 En muzikaal bewegen. Rustig toog hij
 Langs stroom, die met een zwaarder massa thans
 De doolhof diep doorwentelde en zich daar
 Een pad knaagde door dalende boog op boog
 Met vreugdloos haasten. Weerzijds rezen nu
 Rotsen, die onverbeeldbaar van gedaant
 Hun zwarte en naakte toppespitsen staken
 In 't licht van d' avond, en, de steile wand

't Ravijn verduistrend, openden ze omhoog
 In kantelblokken zwart-gapende holen
 Wier windingen tienduizend stemmen gaven
 Aan 't stroomgeschal. Zie, waar zijn steenen kaken
 De pas verbreedt, breekt bruusk de berg en schijnt
 Met zijn opeengehoopte rotsgevaarten
 Te hangen over de aard: want onder 't bleeke
 Gesternté en maan die daalt, spreiden zich wijd
 Beëilande zeeën, blauwe bergen, stroomen,
 Scheemrige en breede streken, glanzig-donker
 Van een loodkleurige avond. Vuurge heuvels
 Menglen met schemer vlammen, op de rand
 Van verre horizon. Het naast tafreel
 Was, in zijn naakte en strenge eenvoudigheid,
 Een tegenbeeld van dat heelal. Een pijn,
 Geworteld in de rots, strekte in het ruim
 Zwaaiende takken, elke ontsadige vlag
 Eén antwoord gevend, bij elk rustverwijn
 Trouwlijk in de eigen maat, met het gehuil,
 De donder en 't gestoom van 't huisloos water
 Zijn plechtige zang vereenend, daar de stroom,
 Breed, schuimend, jagend langs zijn steenige baan,
 Zich neerstortte in dat matelooze leeg,
 Zijn golven strooiende in de haastge wind.

Maar grauwe en steile wand en plechtige pijn
 En val, waren niet alles: één stil oord
 Was daar: de rand-zelf van die machtige berg,
 Door wortelknoesten en gevallen rotsen
 Gesteund: uitziende in onaantastbre vree
 Op donkere aarde en buigend stergewelf.
 Een rustige plek die leek te glimlachen
 In de schoot zelf van 't gruwbre. Klimop klemde
 De breukige steenen in zijn vlechtende armen
 En overwies met altijd groen geblaart
 En donkre bezies 't gladde en vlakke ruim
 Van zijn nog onontwilde vloer, en hier
 Droegen de kinderen van herfstdwarrelwind,
 In dartel spel, het schittrend loof, dat welkend,
 Rood, geel of bleek gelijk een avondlucht,
 Met zomerpronk wedijvert. Dit 's de wijk
 Van iedere zachte wind, die door zijn adem
 De woestenij rust minnen leert. Een stap,
 Eén menschestap alleen heeft ooit de stilte

Van 't eenzaam oord verbroken: ééne stem
 Bezielde er de echoos; de eigen stem alleen
 Die hierheen kwam aandrijvende op de wind,
 Opdat de lieflijkste van menschedaanten
 Die wilde holen tot de bergplaats maakte
 Van al de schoonheid en bevalligheid
 Haar eigen, er haar majesteit aan schonk,
 Muziek strooide op de hartelooze storm,
 En vochtig loof en blauwe grottenaard,
 Voedsters van kleurgebloemt en takkig mos,
 De kleuren gaf van wang die bleekt en bloost,
 Die sneeuwige borst, dat donkre en zinkend oog.

De omloersde maan, gehoornd, hing laag en goot
 Een zee van glans die op de horizon
 De bergen overvloedde. Gele mist
 Vulde de grenslooze atmosfeer en dronk
 Bleek maanlicht tot hij vol was. Niet een ster
 Scheen, niet een klank verklonk: de winden zelfs,
 Gevaars barsch speelvolk, sliepen op die steilt,
 Vast in zijn arm geklemd. O storm van dood!
 Wat sombre nacht splijt uw, onzichtbre spoed!
 En gij, reuzig Geraamte, dat aldoor,
 Geleider van haar onweerstaanbre vaart,
 In uw vernietigende almachtigheid
 Vorst op de breeklijke aard zijt, — van het roode
 Slagveld, van 't dampend hospitaal, 't gewijde
 Bed van de vrijheidsheld, de sneeuwige peul
 Van de onschuld, van schavot en tronen roept
 Een machtige stem u aan. Verwoesting roept
 Zijn broeder Dood. Zeldzame koningsprooi
 Heeft hij bereid, snufflend de wereld door;
 Waarmee verzaad gij rusten moogt, en menschen
 Gaan naar hun graven, bloem of worm gelijk,
 Noch offren ooit meer aan uw zwart outaar
 't Roemloos geschenk van een gebroken hart.

Toen op de drempel van dat groen verblijf
 Des zwervers voetstap viel, wist hij dat Dood
 Hem na was. Nog een poos, voordat zij vlood,
 Opende hij zijn hooge en heilige ziel
 Voor beelden van vergane majesteit
 Die in zijn lijdzaam wezen nu verbleven
 Als winden vol van zoet muziek, die aadmen
 Door duistre traliekamer. Hij ontspande

Zijn bleeke en maagre hand op 't schorsige hout
 Van de oude pijn. Op klimop-groene steen
 Leunde 't veimoeide hoofd; zijn leden rustten
 Ontspierd, bewegingloos op de effen rand
 Van die verborgen kloof; — zoo lag hij dan
 En gaf zich op aan laatste werkingen
 Van 't vlotgeworden leven. Wanhoop, hoop,
 De pijngers, sluimerden: geen smart noch vrees
 Stoorde zijn rust; wat invloede in de zinnen,
 En 't eigen wezen ongemengd met leed,
 Maar zwakker, telkens zwakker, voedde kalm
 De stroom van 't denken; tot hij aadmend lag
 Vredig en zacht glimlachend: — laatst zag hij
 De groote maan, die op de westkim van
 De wijde wereld haar machtge hoorn verhief,
 In de ijle stralen ingeweven donker
 Zich menglend. Boven, op de klippige heuvels
 Rustte ze, en nog, daar de gedeelde vorm
 Van 't breed gesternte zonk, sloeg 's Dichters pols
 Die in geheimvolle eenheid met Natuur,
 Haar eb en vloed, altijd bewoog, zwak mee.
 En toen twee mindrende lichtpunten maar
 Glansden door 't donker, deed het beurtgehijs
 Van zijn flauwe adem de stilstaande nacht
 Ternood bewegen: tot de laatste straal
 Gedoofd was, draalde 't kloppen in zijn hart.
 Het poosde, 't beefde. Doch toen 't hemelwelf
 Volslagen zwart bleef hing de nachtschauw over
 Een beeld, koud, zwijgend en bewegingloos,
 Gelijk haar stemlooze aarde en ledige lucht.
 Zooals een damp met gouden glans gedrenkt,
 Dienaar van 't zonlicht, eer het westen het
 Verbergt, was thans die wondervolle vorm —
 Gevoel, beweging meer, noch godlijkheid;
 Breekbare luit, in samenklank besnaard,
 Waar hemeladem langsvloot; heldre stroom,
 Gevoed eens door veelstemmige golven; droom
 Van jeugd, die nacht en tijd voor altijd doofden,
 Stil, donker, droog en voortaan onherdacht.

O, thans Medea's wondre tooverkunst,
 Die oovral waar ze viel de aard glanzen deed
 Van schitterbloemen en het winterhout
 Van lentebloesem geuren! O dat God,
 Mild met vergiften, mij de kelk vergunde

Die één slechts dronk en leefde, hij die nu,
 Vat van doodlooze toorn, een slaaf die geen
 Trotsch voorrecht voelt in de rampzaalge doem
 Hem opgeladen, eeuwig de aard doorzwerft,
 Eenzaam gelijk Dood zelf! O dat de droom
 Die in zijn grot de donkre toovenaar schouwt,
 Als hij in sintels van zijn vizel speurt
 Naar macht en leven, en zijn hand, verzwakt,
 Trilt in haar laatst verval, de wet mocht zijn
 Van de zoo schoone wereld! Maar gij vloodt
 Als een krachtlooze damp, die dageraad
 In gouden stralen kleedt, ai mij, gij vloodt,
 De dappre en schoone en edelaardige,
 Kind van genie en gratie. Hartloosheid
 Doet en spreekt in de wereld, wormen leven,
 Beesten en menschen, en de machtige Aard
 Heft van zee, berg, van stad en wildernis
 In zachte vesper of blijde ochtendzang
 Aldoor haar plechtige tonen: maar gij vloodt,
 Gij kent niet meer noch mint meer de gedaanten
 Van dit gedroomd tooneel, zij die u waren
 De reinste dienaars, zij die zijn, helaas,
 Nu dat gij vloodt. Laat op die bleeke mond,
 Zoo zoet zelfs in zijn zwijgen, op die oogen
 Die slaap in dood afbeelden, op dat lijf
 Nog door geen worm geschonden, niet een traan
 Vallen, niët in gedachte. Ook, als die tinten
 Vergaan zijn en dat hemelsch wezen zelf,
 Op de ongevoelige wind verwaaid, slechts leeft
 In zwakke maten van mijn simple zang,
 Laat dan trotsch vers, gedachtnis vierende
 Van dat wat niet meer leeft, noch verf die treurt,
 Noch beitel, in machtloos verbeelden hun
 Koud pogen toonen. Kunst, welsprekendheid,
 Al de vertooningen van de aard beweenen
 Vergeefs een leed dat nacht maakt van hun licht.
 Want dat is leed „te diep voor tranen”, als
 Alles op eens sterft, een verheven Geest
 Wiens licht de wereld tooide, hun die blijven
 Zelfs niet de drang tot snik of kreunen laat,
 't Verzet van hoop die zich hartstochtlijk hecht, —
 Maar bleeke Wanhoop, koude Roerloosheid,
 Natuur een vorm, een web het menschbedrijf,
 Geboorte en graf niet als zij zijn geweest. —

ALBERT VERWEY.

The Pan-erotic Element in Shelley.

One of the deepest feelings of Shelley's soul is expressed in a place, where the superficial reader would be least likely to look for its expression: in a play by Shaw. The young poet Marchbanks in *Candida* says to the horrified typist Miss Proserpine: 'We all go about longing for love; it is the first need of our natures, the first prayer of our hearts; but we dare not utter our longing: we are too shy'..... And again: 'You feel that you could love anybody that offered..... the poets talk to themselves out loud, and the world overhears them. But it is horribly lonely not to hear some one else talk sometimes'.

To this feeling the greater part of Shelley's poetry owes its birth. It is the strongest impulse to his creative energy. It modifies his views about many things apparently not connected with it. It finds in his poems its most fervent expression and in his prose its most impassioned vindication. It determines the critical standard by which his work will have to be judged. It makes this work into a soul's treasury, from which the mere beauty-seeker must needs depart empty-handed. For the absence of it, or anything resembling it, in the reader's mind will raise between him and the poet a wall which true enjoyment cannot overleap. It is, according to a Dutch critic,¹⁾ the criterion of the poetic temperament.

'You feel that you could love anybody that offered', says Marchbanks. This comprehensiveness is typically Shelleyan. Lionel in *Rosalind and Helen* 'loved all things ever'. In the essay *On Love* the poet says: 'I have everywhere sought sympathy'. And in the same essay he gives to the question: 'what is love?' the following answer: 'It is that powerful attraction towards all that we conceive, or fear, or hope beyond ourselves, when we find within our own thoughts the chasm of an insufficient void, and seek to awaken in all things that are, a community with what we experience within ourselves'.

The incompleteness of the human soul, then, its inability to live for and by itself, lies at the bottom of this desire. The void requires filling up, and to that end the soul turns literally everywhere. Naturally, it first goes out to another soul, its antitype, 'a miniature of our own self, yet deprived of all that we condemn or despise, the prototype of everything excellent or lovely that we are capable of conceiving as belonging to the nature of man'. The youth in *Alastor* 'thirsts for intercourse with an intelligence similar to itself'. And the voice of the veiled maid in this poem is 'like the voice of his own soul, heard in the calm of thought'.

But if his search is in vain, then, 'in that deserted state when we are surrounded by human beings, and yet they sympathise not with us, we love the flowers, the grass, the waters and the sky. In the motions of the very leaves of spring, in the blue air, there is then found a secret correspondence with our heart'. The love which man refused, will be granted by Nature, whose law, whose very existence is love and intercourse. Do not the fountains mingle with the river and the waves clasp one another? How could Nature then repulse one, who calls himself 'this world of love, this me' (*Epipsychidion*), in whom, as in Lionel, 'love and live were twins, born at one birth'?

¹⁾ J. C. BLOEM, *Het verlangen (De Beweging, 1915)*.

In winds and trees and streams and all things common
 In music and the sweet unconscious tone
 Of animals, and voices which are human,
 Meant to express some feelings of their own;
 In the soft motions and rare smile of woman,
 In flower and leaves, and in the grass fresh-shown,
 Or dying in the autumn, I the most
 Adore thee present, or lament thee lost.

(*The Zucca*).

Needless to say, it is neither in Nature's nor in man's power, to grant the soul's desire, to fill its void, once for all. And so the seeker's quest does not end till death. He will turn in dissatisfaction and disappointment from one object to another. Therefore, only a hopelessly prosaic mind will discover an inconsistency in the poem alluded to above.¹⁾ where the poet plaintively observes a contrast between the accepted desires of natural objects and the rejected offers of the human soul.

The comprehensiveness of the search for an anti-type, the impossibility of complete, and even more the very great possibility of partial attainment, logically preclude the restriction of the heart's affections to one human being. Hence the lines in *Epipsychidion* :

I never was attached to that great sect,
 Whose doctrine is, that each one should select
 Out of the crowd a mistress or a friend,
 And all the rest, though fair and wise, commend
 To cold oblivion, though it is in the code
 Of modern morals, and the beaten road
 Which those poor slaves with weary footsteps tread,
 Who travel to their home among the dead
 By the broad highway of the world, and so
 With one chained friend, perhaps a jealous foe
 The dreariest and the longest journey go.

.....

..... Narrow

The heart that loves, the brain that contemplates,
 The life that wears, the spirit that creates
 One object, and one form, and builds thereby
 A sepulchre for its eternity.

After the foregoing, it will be superfluous to emphasize that the multiplicity of its objects does not, in any way, detract from the intensity of the passion. That eminent critic, Mr. Arthur Symonds,²⁾ who says of Shelley that his way of falling into and out of love is a sign that his emotions were rapid and on the surface, is surely wrong for once. The flippant Lord Henry in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, who remarks : 'those who are faithful

¹⁾ *Love's Philosophy*.

²⁾ *The Romantic Movement in English Poetry*.

know only the trivial side of love, it is the faithless who know love's tragedies', is just as near to, or rather as far from the truth.

In the same way, the logical consequence of the all-embracing pursuit of an idealised equal, will be a disregard of sex. To this point the poet strains his feelings in the fragments connected with *Epipsychidion*, when he says:

And as to friend or mistress, 't is a form

or:

If any should be curious to discover
Whether to you I am a friend or lover,
'Let them read Shakespeare's sonnets, taking thence
A whetstone for their dull intelligence.

However, the unpleasantly frivolous tone of what follows ('I'll pawn my hopes of heaven', etc.) should be a warning to the student who wants to step, at this point, from the domain of Shelley's writings into the sanctuary of his private life, to walk guardedly or, better still, to keep on the threshold.

There is one other result of Shelley's comprehensive conception of love: unlike the ordinary lover, he need not fear the danger of satiety. 'All things that are, are with more spirit chasèd than enjoyed', says Gratiano in one of his rare lucid moments. The Dutch poet Boutens complains 'dat uit bezit en uit gemis dezelfde leegheid over is'. And Jack London refines on this theme in his story *When God Laughs*. The Shelleyan lover runs no such risks. Not his 'the heart high-sorrowful and cloyed, the burning forehead and the parching tongue', his love is 'for ever warm and still to be enjoyed'. Only once in all Shelley's poetry is the word satiety put side by side with love:

Thou lovest, but ne'er knew love's sad satiety.

(*To a Skylark*).

At this point it may be well to point out the side of Shelley's pan-eroticism which has hitherto not been considered, the altruistic one. The youth in *Prince Athanase*, whose spiritual experiences have rightly been identified with Shelley's own, 'did not close the portals of his mind to any whom life's sphere may comprehend within its wide array'. What is said of the poet in Gray's *Elegy*: large was his bounty, and his soul sincere, is equally applicable to Prince Athanase. In fact, Shelley says in strikingly similar words:

Liberal he was of soul, and frank of heart,
And to his many friends — all loved him well,
Whate'er he knew or felt he would impart,
If words he found those inmost thoughts to tell.

His love of his kind goes further still, for:

Such a glorious consolation find
In others' joy, when all their own is dead.

And as the capacity for love is, to Shelley, unlimited in the receiver, so it is in the giver. Those who are morally shocked at the first aspect of his idea of love, can hardly find food for criticism in the second.

True love differs in this from gold and clay
That to divide is not to take away,

and again :

If you divide pleasure and love and thought,
Each part exceeds the whole ; and we know not
How much, while any yet remains unshared,
Of pleasure may be gained, of sorrow spared.

(*Epipsychidion*).

These last three words are significant, if they refer, as I, am firmly convinced they do, to the recipient of the poet's love, not to himself.

The desire to give was in his mind an equally strong goad to action as the hunger to receive. It haunted him to the point of obsession as much as its egoistical counterpart.

For, when the power of imparting joy
Is equal to the will, the human soul
Requires no other Heaven.

(*Queen Mab*).

Not only that it filled a void in times of sorrow, it also drained the cup of his happiness, when there was none to share it. It rendered selfish enjoyment impossible. While his soul is drinking in the beauty of the Mediterranean, he cries out:

How sweet ! did any one now share in my emotion.

(*Stanzas written in Dejection near Naples*).

This line contains the transition from the range of his personal to his artistic experiences. The wish to impart joy is the main source of his creative energy. This point cannot be too strongly emphasized, and a comparison with Keats becomes inevitable. The latter once said of himself: 'I write merely for the enjoyment of creating beautiful things. I should go or writing if I knew that no one cared for my work, or if every morning the fruits of my labour of the previous night were burnt'. This is quite in accordance with the illogical, old-time catchword, which it has cost modern authors and critics so much trouble to outgrow, of 'art for art's sake'. And it is in startling opposition to Shelley's utterance in a letter to Leigh Hunt: 'It is impossible to compose except under the strong excitement of an assurance of finding sympathy in what you write'. In the preface to *The Revolt of Islam* we find that 'it is the business of the Poet to communicate to others the pleasure and the enthusiasm arising out of those images and feelings, in the vivid presence of which within his own mind consists at once his inspiration and his reward'. And in *Julian and Maddalo* he speaks slightly of men who 'study some stubborn art for their own good'. Artistic egoism was as foreign to Shelley's nature as any other form of egoism.

On one of the first pages of Stijn Streuvels, diary called *In Oorlogstijd*, the writer describes how a friend and himself lay on the top of a hill in Flanders, on the 30th of July 1914, talking about the possibility of seeing a battle from that point, and then he says: 'de heerlijkheid van 't grandiose schouwspel wekt het verlangen naar de werkelijkheid om inderdaad de legerscharen te zien oprukken — om van den aanblik te genieten'. A sentiment

like this could never have been expressed by Shelley. The reasoning which underlies it, namely, that no sacrifice to mankind is too great, as long as art profits by it, would have been utterly distasteful to him. To him a thing could never be at the same time beautiful, that is right from the artistic point of view, which a battle may be, and destructive, that is bad from the moral point of view, which a battle certainly is. To continue on this road of approach to Shelley's mind would lead me to a discussion of the union of the moral idealist and the artist in Shelley, which does not lie within the scope of the present article. But it may be permitted to point out that the innate thirst for the sympathy of mankind was one of the motives which made him appeal to all its interests: its love of sensuous beauty, certainly, but also its other ideals, moral, social, political even. And he could do so with impunity, because he was a true poet, and a true poet makes whatever he touches beautiful. Although he himself professes that he hates didactic poetry, he could not help making the world better at the same time when he was making it more beautiful, because to him the ethical ideal was the same as the aesthetical, because to Shelley, far more than to Keats, Truth was Beauty, Beauty Truth. As the expanding bud opens its leaves to the rays of light and warmth, so the soul of Shelley let in Truth and Beauty. And their common origin is the Sun of Love.

Hence his conception of love colours his views of all things with which the happiness of man is bound up: religion, morals, the state, marriage. Love, he says in the preface to *The Revolt of Islam*, is the sole law which should govern the moral world. It is not compatible with current religious or political beliefs:

To live, as if to love and live were one,
This is not faith or law, not those who bow
To thrones in Heaven or Earth, such destiny may know.
(*Revolt of Islam*, Canto VIII).

And some of Athanase's friends believe that

God's displeasure, like a darkness, fell
On souls like his, which owned no higher law
Than love.

In the Temple of Nature only such love can be solemnized:

We will have rites our faith to bind,
But our church shall be the starry night,
Our altar the grassy earth outspread,
And our priest the muttering wind.
(*Rosalind and Helen*)

But, though conventional religion may go against it,

Jesus Christ Himself did never cease
To urge all living things to love each other.
(*Fragments connected with Epipsychidion*).

Shelley's views on the relation between love and marriage are expressed in the lines from *Epipsychidion* quoted above, and in the *Notes on Queen*

Mat. When we find there, that 'love is inevitably consequent upon the perception of loveliness', and that 'constancy has nothing virtuous in itself, independently of the pleasure it confers', we realize more than ever, that marriage is indeed not for such as Shelley. But their gain is proportioned to their loss. On the one hand, they may say at the end of their lives, in the words of Henriëtte Roland Holst:

Mij werd het of 'k sinds jaar en dag,
Aan den buitenkant dwaalde van 't leven,
En hunkrend naar binnen zag.

Shelley himself felt it in that way, when he wrote in one of his last letters: 'One is always in love with something or other. The error consists in seeking in a mortal image the likeness of what is, perhaps, eternal.' But on the other hand, theirs can never be the fate of those who, as it says in the preface to *Alastor* 'keep aloof from sympathies with their kind; who dare to abjure the dominion of love, whose hearts are dry as summer dust, and who thus constitute the lasting misery and loneliness of the world'. For, though sought and missed, or gained and lost, at a dear price,

Thou art the wine whose drunkenness is all
We can desire, o Love! and happy souls,
Ere from thy vine the leaves of autumn fall,

Catch thee, and feed from their o'erflowing bowls
Thousands who thirst for thine ambrosial dew; —
Thou art the radiance which where ocean rolls

Investeth it; and when the heavens are blue
Thou fillest them; and when the earth is fair
The shadow of thy moving wings imbue

Its deserts and its mountains, till they wear
Beauty like some light robe; — thou ever soarest
Among the towers of men, and as soft air

In spring, which moves the unawakened forest,
Clothing with leaves its branches bare and bleak,
Thou floatest among men; and aye implorest

That which from thee they should implore: the weak
Alone kneel to thee, offering up the hearts
The strong have broken — yet where shall any seek

A garment whom thou clothest not?

(*Prince Athanase*).

Therefore, we may feel sure that if an early death had not ended his troubles, Shelley would, in spite of all, have gone on, or, like the clergyman in Galsworthy's *A Bit o' Love* have prayed for strength to go on, till he loved all living things.

J. KOOISTRA.

Shelley-Bibliography.

1908—1922. ¹⁾

a. ENGLISH.

Shelley's Literary and Philosophical Criticism, edited with an introduction by JOHN SHAWCROSS. pp. XIV + 244. Henry Frowde, London, 1909.

The Poetical Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley, with an introduction by DR. RICHARD GARNETT. Ward, Lock and Co. London, 1911.

The Poems of Percy Bysshe Shelley, edited with notes by C. D. LOCOCK. With an introduction by A. CLUTTON-BROCK. 2 vols. Methuen and Co. London, 1911.

The Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley, edited by ROGER INGPEN. New edition with additions and corrections. 2 vols. 1915. (Bohn's Standard Library).

A Study of Shelley's Drama The Cenci. By E. S. BATES. (Columbia University Studies in English, 1908).

Peacock's Memoirs of Shelley, edited by H. F. BRETT SMITH. London, Henry Frowde, 1909.

Shelley, an essay. By FRANCIS THOMPSON (poet.). Burns and Oates, 1909.

Shelley, the man and the poet. By A. CLUTTON-BROCK. London.

Shelley's prose in the Bodleian manuscripts. Edited with corrections etc. by A. KOSZUL. London, 1910.

Shelley and his Friends in Italy. By HELEN R. ANGELI. 1911.

Essay on Shelley. By ROBERT BROWNING. Boston, 1911.

The romantic life of Shelley and the sequel. By F. GRIBBLE. London, 1911.

Keats and Shelley Studies. By MARY SUDDARD. Cambridge, 1912.

Imagery and Style in Shelley. By EDITH BIRKHEAD. 1912. (Primitiae. Essays in English literature by students of the University of Liverpool).

Percy Bysshe Shelley, poet and pioneer. By HENRY S. SALT, 1913.

The Life of P. B. Shelley. By THOMAS MEDWIN. With Introduction and Commentary by H. B. FORMAN. Oxford University Press, 1913.

Platonism in Shelley. By LILIAN WINSTANLEY, 1913. (English Association Essays and Studies).

Shelley, Godwin and their Circle. By H. N. BRAILSFORD. (Home University Library). London, 1913.

Letters about Shelley. By DOWDEN, GARNETT and ROSSETTI. London, 1917.

Shelley in England. By R. INGPEN, 1917.

Shelley. By ANDREW OSBORN, 1919.

The Relations of Percy Bysshe Shelley with his two wives Harriet and Mary. By EDWARD T. TRELAWNEY, 1920.

A Philosophical View of Reform. By P. B. SHELLEY. Edited by T. W. ROLLSTONE. Oxford University Press. 1920.

Correspondence of Lord Byron (London, Murray 1922).

Studies in Literature, second series. By SIR ARTHUR QUILLER-BOUCH. Cambridge University Press. London, 1922.

Shelley, Byron, Milton and Chaucer are among the writers dealt with.

Three Studies in Shelley and An Essay on Nature in Wordsworth and Meredith. By ARCHIBALD T. STRONG. Oxford University Press. London, 1921.

These three studies deal with the *Faith of Shelley*, the *Sinister in Shelley*, and *Shelley's Symbolism*. The first examines the poet's attitude towards Christianity, his belief regarding the immortality of the soul, the doctrine of necessity, the perfectibility of human nature, his conception of evil, and the influence of Spinoza, Plato, and Godwin on his thought. The essay on *Symbolism* discusses Shelley's metaphorical use of such words as *veil*, *serpent*, *meteor*, *poison*, *scorpion*, *boat*, *moon*. The *Sinister in Shelley* exposes 'that in his poetry which puts him in touch rather with Poe and Baudelaire than with Sophocles and Plato', and mainly concerns itself with his want of veracity or 'semi-delusions', his interest in the supernatural, his relations with women, and, in his writings, his constant preoccupation with putrefaction and decay.

¹⁾ The following collection of books and articles on Shelley, published since 1908, though not exhaustive, will be found fairly complete, and as such, it is to be hoped, useful. For the bibliography before 1908 the reader is referred to ACKERMANN, *Percy Bysshe Shelley, der Mann, der Dichter und seine Werke* (Dortmund 1906). To the title of some of the works, mainly the less accessible ones, a short summary or appreciation has been added. The compiler's best thanks are due to Fr. Helene Richter, Vienna; Dr. F. Asanger, Bochum; Prof. A. Koszul, Strassbourg; Prof. V. Mathesius, Prague; Prof. S. B. Liljegen, Lund; Mr. D. Spanjaard, The Hague; Mr. M. Braaksma, Leeuwarden; and the staff of the Groningen Public Library. — J. KOOLSTRA.

Shelley and His Poetry. By E. W. EDMUNDS. London, Harrap and Co. 1911.

This little volume, belonging to the Poetry and Life Series, is a combination of a biography and an anthology, an unobjectionable book in the hands of a beginner, though rather too full of commonplaces.

Select Poems of Percy Bysshe Shelley. Edited with Introduction and Notes by GEORGE E. WOODBERRY. Boston, U.S.A. and London, D. C. Heath & Co. 1908.

The Cenci by PERCY BYSSHE SHELLEY. Edited by GEORGE EDWARD WOODBERRY. Boston, U.S.A. and London, D. C. Heath & Co. 1909.

These two editions belong to Heath's Belles-Lettres Series. The "Select Poems" contain a good introduction to Shelley's lyrics and 10 pp. of literary notes. The Introduction to *The Cenci* gives an excellent analysis of the play; besides, some interesting things are said in it about Sh.'s obligations to Shakespeare. Also the appendix, dealing with the sources of the *Cenci* is useful. An exhaustive bibliography fills the last pages of this valuable publication.

Shelley's View of Poetry, a lecture. By A. C. BRADLEY, 1908. (English Association Leaflets, no 4).

After insisting on the wide meaning of the word poetry, the author points out that Sh. was never particular about fine phrases and details of execution. But no poetry is more manifestly inspired. It is free from the vices of self-consciousness. Sh.'s theory of poetry is not opposed to his own practice: the poet may write of absolutely anything, so long as he can colour it with the hues of the ideal. With regard to the lines in 'Adonais'

Life, like a dome of many-coloured glass,
Stains the white radiance of eternity,

B. remarks that Shelley tends to forget the other side, viz. that the many colours are the white light broken.

The true moral effect of poetry is produced through imagination, and not through doctrine; the true moral virtue of Shelley's poetry lies in an intuition of the unique value of love.

How Shelley approached the Ode to the West Wind. By H. BUXTON FORMAN. Macmillan & Co, 1913.

In one of the poet's note books given by Sir Percy and Lady Shelley to Dr. Garnett we see Shelley's struggle with the terza rima and find the passage:

Scatter, as from an unextinguished hearth,
Ashes and sparks, my words among mankind!

adumbrated in the lines:

But as my hopes were fire, so my decay
Shall be as ashes covering them. Oh Earth,
Oh friends, if when my has ebbed away
One spark be unextinguished of that hearth
Kindled in

The author remembers having seen "somewhere at some time" a holograph manuscript of the ode or part of it, containing for its last line:

O Wind,

When Winter comes, Spring lags not far behind.

and calls the change into the form which we know, "a transformation from the thinker's dogmatic assertion to the singer's tremulous question".

On the first two lines of Epipsychidion. By A. DE BOSIS. Macmillan & Co, 1913.

Garnett, in 'Relics of Shelley' has said (p. 97): The orphan one, Emilia's spiritual sister, is Mary Shelley, whose mother died in giving her birth; the name is Shelley's own.

De Bosis says, the orphan one is the spirit of Shelley. "I suspect that Mr. Garnett and others have been led into that error by the word 'Sister' taken as a bond between two similar beings, as though besides sister to sister one could not be sister to a brother!" The proof — thus De Bosis — is furnished by the few lines of Italian at the back of one of the leaves of the holograph manuscript of 'The Mask of Anarchy'.

bella dolce
chi sei la sorella

Anima
Di quella orfana anima che regge
Il nome e la forma mia

And why, says the author, is Shelley's name a source of tears to Emilia Viviani? Because 'persi' in Italian means 'lost'. The reader, to whom this explanation seems somewhat fanciful, will be positively startled by the last line of this clever study, which runs: I would be glad, if my interpretation should be accepted, for, although it differs essentially from Dr. Garnett's, *I propose or rather state it simply because I know it to be right.* (the italics are De B.'s).

Shelley and Calderon (and other essays on English and Spanish Poetry). By MADARIAGA. Constable & Co, 1920.

Shelley discovered a resemblance between Calderon and Shakespeare. Madariaga states a difference: Shakespeare's mind was as neutral to man's ways and thoughts as water to colour. He was a pantheist, and his view of the world was essentially aesthetic. His philosophy was poetry. Calderon lived in and for his Catholic faith. His ideas were strictly orthodox and his mind was dogmatic.

There is in Shelley's poetry a certain internal stiffness, an almost mechanical rigidity, hidden under an admirably fluid external rhythm, which becomes quite pronounced in the grotesque or satirical works, such as *Peter Bell the Third*, and *Swellfoot the Tyrant*.

We are here at one of the points where Shelley and Calderon meet. Shelley does not understand comedy. He was as dogmatic in his revolutionary creed as Calderon in his religion. The composition of the Ode to the West Wind is the most brilliant example of Calderon's action (sic) over Shelley. Shelley's taste for weird scenery was not unlike that of Calderon. Rocks, crags and precipices are their favourite element.

Madariaga calls Shelley's mind opposed to Matthew Arnold's and Wordsworth's British utilitarianism. Mary said his tastes discarded human interest. Madariaga disputes this notion: it is precisely because Sh. was too deeply obsessed with *man* that he could not write on *men*. His poetry did not dwell on human character, but only because it was overwhelmed by human destiny. And that is perhaps why Sh. found in Calderon a fellow-mind.

Note on a Passage in Shelley's Ode to Liberty. By THOMAS J. C. SANDERSON. (Doves Press. Hammersmith, 1914).

Twins of a single destiny! appeal
To the eternal years enthroned before us
In the dim West; impress us from a seal,
All ye have thought and done! Time cannot dare conceal.

Swinburne said: The construction (from 'impress' onward) is wild and falls to pieces. The sense at starting is clearly: Impress us with all ye have thought and done, which time cannot dare conceal, or: let all ye have thought and done impress us, etc.

Rossetti (1870) takes *ye* to refer to Spain and England.

Forman (1876) identifies *ye* with Republicanism in America.

Mr Sanderson objects that Sh., of all others, would not appeal to Spain, the protagonist of Tyranny, the champion of the Papacy, the author of the Inquisition, "to impress us, . . .".

Mr. Forman's interpretation does violence to the text in several respects. (Forman, by the way, conjectures that 'us' should be 'as').

S' s reading is as follows: *ye* refers to 'the eternal years'; *us* is simply us, the people, or world at large; 'impress us from a seal all ye have thought and done' is the matter of the appeal which the twins of a single destiny, are invited to make to the eternal years. S. understands 'the eternal years enthroned before us in the dim West' to mean the years of revolution already accomplished in the West (this revolution is achieved, fixed and unchangeable, enthroned and matter for a 'seal') and refers for a comparison to the lines in 'Hellas':

But Greece and her foundations . . .
. . . on all the world of men inherits Their seal is set.
The destiny of the twins is single, — Liberty!

b. GERMAN.

Spensers literarisches Nachleben bis zu Shelley. Von T. BÖHME. Berlin 1909. Mayer und Müller, pp. IX + 349. (Chapter 7, 5. Spensers Einfluss auf Shelley).

Die persönlichen Beziehungen zwischen Byron und den Shelleys. Von M. EIMER. Heidelberg 1910. C. Winter, pp. XII + 149.

P. B. Shelley als Übersetzer aus italienischen, deutschen und spanischen Dichtungen. Von J. GIESEN. I Teil. Shelley als Übersetzer aus dem Italienischen. Freiburg 1910. Diss. pp. 75.

Wörterbuch zu den englischen Dichtungen von Percy Bysshe Shelley. Von L. VOLKLAND. Teil I. A.-M. Leipzig 1910. Diss. pp. X + 81.

P. B. Shelley's Sprachstudien. Seine Übersetzungen aus dem Lateinischen und Griechischen. Von F. ASANGER. Münster 1911. Diss. pp. 141.

Shelley als Romantiker. Von H. SCHMITT. Marburg 1911. Diss. pp. 52.

Shelley's Verskunst. Von A. KRÖDER. Münchener Beiträge, 1913.

Besprechung: Van Dam. *Englische Studien*, 34, 1.

Das poetische Geschlecht der Substantive in den Dichtungen Percy Bysshe Shelleys. Von H. LYBE. Kiel 1916. Diss. pp. XVI + 189.

Tennyson und Keats. Eine Untersuchung des Einflusses von Keats auf Tennyson mit Berücksichtigung von Shelley. Von F. SCHNEIDER. Münster 1916. Diss. pp. VIII + 110.

Studien zu Shelleys Lyrik. Von H. HUSCHER. Leipzig 1919. B. Tauchnitz, pp. 156.

Reviewed *Engl. Studies*, II, 149.

Die Beziehungen zwischen Byron und Leigh Hunt. Von W. SCHIRMER. Freiburg Diss.

Besprechung: Helene Richter, *Englische Studien*, 1917.

Percy Bysshe Shelley. Sämtliche Dichtungen. In Einzelübertragungen herausgegeben von J. H. NEUENDORFF. 1 Bändchen: Alastor. Dresden 1909. pp. XVI + 35.

P. B. Shelley's Prometheus Unbound. Erste kritische Ausgabe mit Einleitung und Kommentar, herausg. von RICHARD ACKERMANN. Heidelberg 1908. Carl Winter. XLIV + 132.

Besprechung: Helene Richter, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 30 Jan. 1909.

Zu Shelley's Dichtung 'The Wandering Jew'. Von M. EIMER. (*Anglia*, 38, 3, 4).

Shelley als Romantiker. Von H. SCHMITT. (*Englische Studien*, 44, 1.)

The Nascent Mind of Shelley. By A. M. D. HUGHES. (*Engl. Studien*, 45, 1.)

Some Recent English Shelley literature. By A. M. D. HUGHES. (*Engl. Studien*, 45, 2.)

Einflüsse deutscher Räuber- und Schauer-romantik auf Shelley, Mrs. Shelley und Byron. Von M. EIMER. (*Englische Studien*, 48, 2.)

Ergänzungen Captain E. E. Williams' Journal. (1821—'22). Von M. EIMER. *Englische Studien*, 49, 1.)

Ein unbekannter Brief Shelleys an Ollier. Von W. FISCHER. (*Engl. Studien*, 51, 3.)

Synaesthesien in der englischen Dichtung des 19 Jahrhunderts. Von E. VON SIEBOLD. (Shelley, p. 223—246). *Engl. Studien*, 53, 2.

Shelley in Fiction. By L. H. ALLEN. (*Zeitschr. für franz. und engl. Unterricht*, 6, 5 und 7, 2).

Shelley und der Weltkrieg. Von W. WAGNER. (*Zeitschr. für franz. und engl. Unterricht*, 16, 1.)

P. B. Shelley. Zum hundertsten Gedenktag seines Todes. Von H. RICHTER. (*Neue Freie Presse*, 8 Juli 1922).

c. FRENCH.

Shelley, traduction et introduction. Par A. KOSZUL. Les Cent Chefs d'Oeuvre Etrangers. La Renaissance du Livre, Paris 1922.

In the press, about 200 pp.; extracts translated, occasionally in blank or rhymed verse.

La Jeunesse de Shelley. Par ANDRÉ KOSZUL. Bloud, Paris 1910. 439 pp.

Essentially a psychological and literary study; some unpublished material in the Appendices pp. 401-489.

De l'emploi du symbole dans la poésie de Shelley. Par CAROLINE F. E. SPURGEON. *Revue germanique*, Juillet-Aout 1912. pp. 426-432.

Especially the symbolical value of light and shade.

Oeuvres Poétiques de Shelley, traduites en français par RABBE. Paris 1908.

d. ITALIAN.

Saggio di Studi Shelleyani. By L. BERNHEIMER. Piacenza 1920, 35 pp.

Treats of Shelley's sojourn in Italy and the poems there composed.

e. CZECH.

Percy Bysshe Shelley, VÝBOR Z PROSY (A Selection of Prose Writings). PŘELOŽIL, ÚVOD A POZNÁMKY NAPSAL F. CHUDOBA. (Translated, with a preface and notes, by F. Chudoba).

(OTÁZKY A NÁZORY, XLVII. PRAHA, J. LAICHTER. 1920. Two volumes. Vol. I. Pp. XLV+278. I. Essays on Literature and Fine Arts. II. Philosophical and Religious Pieces. III. Political Pamphlets). Vol. II. Pp. 334. (I. Narrative Fragments II. Letters).

F. CHUDOBA, Shelley v ZRCADLE SVÝCH DOPISŮ (Shelley in the mirror of his letters). NOVINA, 3/1909. PRAHA. Pp. 371 ss., 402 ss., 425 ss., 459 ss., 494 ss., 522 ss. (Reprinted in F.

CHUDOBA, BÁSNÍCI, VĚSTCI A BOJOVNÍCI. ČÁST PRVÁ. PRAHA, MÁNES. 1915. Pp. 17-53).

F. CHUDOBA, THOMSONŮV Shelley (Thomson's Shelley). PŘEHLED, 7/1908-9. PRAHA. Pp. 825 ss., 866 ss.

f. FINNISH.

Sonnetter och Sanger, translations of foreign poetry by E. ZILLIACUS. Helsingfors 1921

g. POLISH.

Stowacki-Shelley. By R. CIOTKOŚ. Tarnow 1909, 42 pp.

The author compares and draws an elaborate parallel between Stowacki's *W Sewajcaryi* and *Beatrix Cenci*, on the one hand and Shelley's *Epipsychidion* and *The Cenci* on the other.

h. DUTCH.

Shelley's Alastor, vertaald door Dr. K. H. DE RAAF, met inleiding van W. Kloos. (Rotterdam, Brusse.)

Percy Bysshe Shelley. *Prometheus Ontboeid*, vertaald door ALEX GUTTeling. (Wereldbibliotheek).

Shelley. Prometheus Unbound, door J. J. VAN DER LEEUW. (*Minerva*, 11, 18, 25 Mei, 2, 8 Juni 1916).

Gutteling's Prometheus-vertaling door P. N. VAN EYCK. (*Beweging*, 1916. II).

Van Eyck en Gutteling's Prometheus-vertaling door W. KLOOS. (*N. Gids*, 1916. IV).

Prometheus' zonde, door K. KUIPER. (*Onze Eeuw*, 1911. I.)

Shelley. Adonais, vertaald door A. GUTTeling. (*Beweging*, 1914. IV).

Shelley. Het Kruidje-roer-mij-niet, vertaald door G. DE GRAAF. (*Buiten*, 8 April 1911.)

Nieuwere Literatuurgeschiedenis, door W. KLOOS.

Deel III, hoofdst. XXIX, bl. 27, hoofdst. XXX, bl. 32; deel IV, hoofdst. LXXXV, bl. 177, hoofdst. LXXXVI, bl. 184, hoofdst. LXXXVII, bl. 192; deel V, hoofdst. CIX, bl. 196; deel VI, hoofdst. CXIII, bl. 7, hoofdst. CXIV, bl. 24, hoofdst. CXVII, bl. 66, 67 en 72, hoofdst. CXVIII, bl. 82 en 83, hoofdst. CXX, bl. 111 en 125, hoofdst. CXXIII, bl. 159 en 167; deel IX, hoofdst. CLVI, CLXIV, CLXVI bl. 197.

Opstandigheid en Dichtkunst [III, de beweging van '80 en Shelley]. Door Is. P. DE VOOYS. (*Beweging*, 1911. 1 en II).

Aanteekening by Shelley's Epipsychidion. Door A. VERWEY. (*Beweging*, 1916, II).

Ruin-ravin. Door W. KLOOS. (*N. Gids*, 1916, dl. II, blz. 273-291; 448-459).

Shelley's Prometheus Unbound. By J. KOOISTRA. (*Neophilologus*, jrg. 1).

Demogorgon in Shelley's Prometheus Unbound. By A. G. VAN KRANENDONK. (*Neophilologus*, jrg. 2).

Some notes on the metre of The Sensitive Plant. By A. G. v. KRANENDONK. (*Neophilologus*, jrg. 4).

- Shelley en Vondel*. Door A. T. A. HEYTING. (*Tijdspiegel*, 1911, III).
De dichtkunst verdedigd. Door H. WISMANS. (*Katholiek* 1917).
Shelley. Door H. WISMANS. (*Katholiek*, 1917).
Vertaling van The Ode to the West Wind. Door H. WISMANS. (*Katholiek*, 1917).
Over Vondel, Milton en Shelley. [De bezielende gedachte in Shelley's Prometheus Unbound] Door D. TOL. (*N. Gids*, 1917, I).
Shelley's Hellas. Door H. BOEKEN. [Aanteekeningen over kunst en letteren]. (*N. Gids*, 1915, II)
Shelley, Verzen, door WILLEM KLOOS. [met toelichting]. (*N. Gids*, 1921, II).
Vertaling van Ode to the West Wind. Door R. TER LAAN. (*Amst. Weekbl.*, 8 Juli 1916).
Praeludium van Alastor, vertaald met inleiding door R. TER LAAN. (*Groot Nederland* 1918, II).
Shelley's Adonais in het Friesch, vertaald door D. KALMA. (*Guiden Winckel*, 1917).
Een verklaring van de eerste verzen van Shelley's Epipsychidion [see English section] (*N. Rott. Ct.*, 4, 9, 22 Maart 1916 Av., 7 Maart '16 Ocht.).
Id. (K. H. DE RAAF, *Nieuwe Gids*, 1916, I).
Id. (ALBERT VERWEY, *Beweging*, 1916, II).
Prometheus. Door C. VAN BRUGGEN. bl. 527—557. (Nijgh en Van Ditmar, 1919).
Gedigte, door TH. WASSENAAR. (Swets en Zeitlinger)
 (Contains two sonnets „Aan Shelley” pp. 18 and 19).

i. FRISIAN.

- Shelley's Adonais*, oerset en ynlaet fen D. KALMA. (Van der Spoel & Co, Grou 1916).
Shelly's Alastor yn oersetting fen RINKE TOLMAN en D. KALMA. (A. J. Osinga, Snits 1918).
Shelley's Ode oan Frydom (*Frisia*, 4e jrg. 1920).
De greate stimmen. Fen D. KALMA. [Ynliding ta moderne taelkinst, III. Shelley (syn tiid), IIIa — syn wirk] (*De nye Mienskip*, Jrg. I No. 5 en 6).
-

The Women of George Eliot's Novels.

The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are remarkable for the progress made in science. Much of it was due to the method of analysis, of inductive inquiry and of research in all the facts of nature for the laws which underlie them. The favourable results gained by it, induced artists to adopt the same procedure with regard to literature. The first outcome of this attempt were mere photographic studies of life. But gradually this new method was applied in a more sympathetic spirit to the deeper problems of the human heart with a view of interpreting man from within in his motives and impulses, of showing why he acts, and of unfolding his subtler elements. Thus, some fifty years ago, the psychological novel came into existence. Its centre lies in the development and analysis of man's soul, in the invisible world of inclinations and dispositions. Its problems are inward, and though circumstance may be indispensable, it serves but as a setting.

One of the most conspicuous representatives of the psychological novel is George Eliot. She combined profound culture in philosophy with keen observation and a rare capacity for imaginative insight. Being besides of a passionate and highly susceptible nature, all nerves and impulses, she had undergone many painful struggles and hard disappointments, already before she took to novel-writing. Consequently she was all the better able to understand equal suffering in others; for, as she says herself: "There are certain secrets taught only by pain."¹) Thus she was well prepared for the study of the human heart on which she lays great stress in all her works. Her method, as she tells us, was to begin with minds, thoughts and passions, and then invent the story for their sake and fit it to them. Everything was dependent on "her psychological conception of the dramatis personae."²) The soul of woman with her greater depth and range of emotions had naturally a special attraction for George Eliot. She delights in showing her to us in the process of expanding, in opening her inmost secrets, in analysing her motives. Each of her novels contains one or several female figures, many of whom may be ranked among the best in English literature.

George Eliot delineates altruistic souls, who suppress all claims of self-gratification and devote themselves entirely to the welfare of others. But she also introduces to us egoistic women who regard all their selfish demands as rights, and every claim upon them as an injury. And she draws mixed characters in whom the conflict between individual life with its need of self-development, and the laws given by society, between egoistic desires, and duties which conscience sets up, is violent and does not always end with victory.

The chief representatives of altruism are to be found in George Eliot's earlier novels, so in *The Sad Fortunes of the Reverend Amos Barton*, in which in the person of Mrs. Barton we are shown self-sacrifice in its pathetic form; in *Aaam Bede*, in which Dinah Morris personifies self-devotion under the influence of religion, and in *Silas Marner*, in which Mrs. Winthrop's cheerful readiness to help her neighbours is so agreeable.

¹) J. W. Cross: G. Eliot's Life I. p. 55.

²) " " " " " I. p. 349.

Milly Barton, the wife of the Vicar of Shepperton, is introduced to us as a loving wife and mother, a kind mistress and a genuine friend whose overflowing love for her husband and her children keeps her heart always light, even when her feeble body is exhausted with the day's work. When her health in consequence of the exertions and privations she had taken upon her for her family, is daily failing more and more, the "fair, gentle Madonna" in spite of her illness, never complains, till the great friend of mankind, death, comes to lead her into a better country, too early for her family, but in due time for the patient sufferer. Her last hour is quite in keeping with her life: she cannot deny her loving nature. Her parting words are full of motherly tenderness for her poor children, and of gratitude for her husband. "You have been — very — good to me. You — have — made me — very — happy". ¹⁾ — Happy? Yes, for

Love seeketh not itself to please,
Nor for itself has any care,
But for another gives its ease,
And builds a heaven in hell's despair. ²⁾

The delineation of Milly Barton's character was George Eliot's first attempt in this direction. It was a good beginning and a fair promise for what was to come after. But she confesses herself, that her work was not yet perfect. "That was my first bit of art, and my hand was not well in. I did not know so well how to manipulate my materials". ³⁾ She tried too much to explain her character by means of description, instead of allowing it to evolve in the action of the story. There is, in fact, too much of a portrait of one of George Eliot's acquaintances in Mrs. Barton.

Not so in Dinah Morris, one of the heroines of *Adam Bede*, of whom G. Eliot writes in her journal: "The character of Dinah grew out of my recollections of my aunt; but Dinah is not at all like my aunt. Indeed, there is not a single portrait in *Adam Bede*, only the suggestions of experience wrought up into new combinations. Everything else grew out of the characters and their mutual relations." ⁴⁾

Dinah Morris is a Methodist preacher. A slim girl with an oval face of transparent whiteness, with soft grey eyes and pale reddish hair, she stands before her audience speaking directly from her own emotions and inspired by her simple faith. After the early loss of her parents she had already as a child become acquainted with all sorts of misery, both bodily and mental, and her innate love for the suffering part of mankind increased daily. She tended the sick and comforted the mourning, not only out of her natural inclination, but especially because she regarded herself as called by God to minister to others, to have neither joys nor sorrows of her own. By her frequent visits to the sick and sorrow-stricken she had gained so good an experience in the treatment of afflicted souls that even minds, very hardened and shrivelled through want, ignorance and guilt cannot resist her. That is especially seen when Hetty Sorrel, a cousin of hers, who had murdered her child and, though facts spoke strongly against her, denied it, is brought face to face with Dinah. Her gentle and prudent words, overflowing with love and tenderness, become the key to the unhappy girl's heart. Hetty pours forth the confession of her crime and Dinah pacifies her bewildered mind and directs her thoughts towards God. — Hitherto Dinah had only

¹⁾ *Ibidem*, p. 126.

²⁾ William Blake, *Songs of Experience*.

³⁾ J. W. Cross, *G. Eliot's Life*, vol. I, p. 486.

⁴⁾ *Ibidem*, p. 446 ff.

known charitable love, that sort of love which is hardly to be distinguished from religious feeling. But by and by she comes to know what real love is, and a hard struggle between her inclination and her duty or what she considers to be her duty rises. "It is a temptation that I must resist," she thinks, "lest the love of the creatures should become like a mist in my soul, shutting out the heavenly light."¹⁾ Yet soon she becomes aware of her error. "It is the Divine Will," she says to Adam Bede, "my soul is so knit to yours that it is but a divided life I live without you."²⁾ She becomes his wife and spreads over the circle of his family that pure joy and happiness which can spring forth only from unselfish souls.

Dinah's character is undoubtedly a fine one, one which we cannot but admire. Her self-devoting love, the delicacy and nobility of her feeling are delineated with elaborate skill. But we regret that G. Eliot did not attribute to her heroine some of those faults of which she says that they

Are the fruity must of soundest wine
Or say, they are regenerating fire
Such as has turned the dense black element
Into a crystal pathway for the sun.³⁾

Then Dinah would have harmonized better with her surroundings, and we would not have been obliged to say with Seth Bede that she was "too good and too holy" for this world.

While Dinah's ideal nature rouses doubts as to its reality, no such thoughts enter our minds when we turn our attention to Mrs. Winthrop in *Silas Marner*. She is one of those fine creations of G. Eliot's which, with subtle differences and variations, we find in *The Sad Fortunes of the Reverend Amos Barton* as Mrs. Hackitt, in *Adam Bede* as Mrs. Poyser, and in *Middlemarch* as Mrs. Cadwallader. They are women with a wide heart, a ready hand, and a more or less ready tongue, women who stand forth fresh and life-like, and are not easily to be forgotten. In all of them one of the greatest charms of George Eliot's characters makes itself felt: they talk entirely to their nature. There is nothing stilted or affected in their speech.

"Let somebody run to Winthrop's and fetch Dolly," says Dr. Kimble, when a woman has been found frozen in the Stone-pits. "She is the best woman to get."⁴⁾ That she is indeed, Dolly Winthrop, the wheelwright's wife, the person of whom all think first in Raveloe when there is illness or death in a family, or when extraordinary help is wanted. For Mrs. Winthrop is sure to come, and the mere aspect of the good-looking, fresh-complexioned woman is comforting and reassuring in trouble and confusion. She feels strongly drawn towards the sad and the suffering, and does her best to relieve them. That is best shown in her behaviour towards Silas Marner, the weaver who having been betrayed by his friend and deserted by the girl whom he loved, had lost all his confidence in mankind, and had set his whole heart on money. Her kind words, her never-failing help, the services rendered to him with the fine tact of a noble-hearted woman bring Silas again into a friendly contact with his neighbours, and change the miser entirely. There are people whom frequent intercourse with suffering and sad men makes whimpering and morose. No such thing in Dolly. She gets along wonderfully with her husband who is rather fond of his quart-pot. "Men would be so," she says good-humouredly, "who could help it that

¹⁾ *Adam Bede*, vol. II, 249.

²⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 324.

³⁾ *Middlemarch*, p. 484.

⁴⁾ *Silas Marner*, p. 188.

it had pleased Heaven to make them naturally troublesome like bulls and turkeycocks?"¹⁾ What about Mrs. Winthrop as a mother? We do not hear much of her in this respect, only that she sadly spoils her youngest son, as she herself is obliged to confess. When, however, Eppie's, Silas Marner's adopted daughter's knowledge of Mrs. Winthrop makes her feel that a mother must be very precious, can we then doubt that she is a kind and loving mother?

With Mrs. Barton, Dinah Morris and Mrs. Winthrop the series of altruistic women in George Eliot's novels is far from being complete. There are still more who deserve being mentioned. Mrs. Hackitt in *The Sad Fortunes of the Reverend Amos Barton*, who helps the Vicar's family in such a delicate way; Mrs. Meyrick, the "little mother", in *Daniel Deronda*, for whom to live means to make others, especially her children, comfortable; Mirah Cohen in the same novel, who shows how unselfish love is entirely satisfied in the completeness of the beloved subject; Mrs. Garth in *Middlemarch*, to whom thinking of her family's welfare comes as natural as taking breath; sweet Lucy Deane in *The Mill on the Floss*, who, still suffering from the consequences of a great disappointment, chiefly brought about by her cousin Maggie, secretly goes to comfort her. All of them make us feel that life is really worth living when its object is not the gratification of our own pettish desires, but the endeavour to lighten the burdens of others.

G. Eliot's delineation of nearly all her female egoists is remarkable for a lofty toleration. Her personal experience of human misery and suffering had taught her this great lesson of life. Therefore she contemplates the faults of men with kindness, and her condemnation of evil is tempered by the consciousness of her own frailty.

A relentless and yet sympathetic touch is to be observed in her presentation of that beautiful little sinner Hetty Sorrel. It seems that G. Eliot, like Mrs. Poyser, though perfectly aware of all the shallowness of Hetty's nature, cannot help continually gazing at the girl's charms on the sly, and being fascinated by them, in spite of themselves. And who is not likewise attracted by her spring-tide beauty: her cheeks like rose-petals, her dark eyes which hide a soft roguishness, and her delicately curled hair? Who can forget Hetty in the dairy where she is shown to us in the nicest attitudes and movements? Having thus secured our sympathy for the lovely girl, G. Eliot begins to develop her character, sure that, once in love with her heroine, we will never judge her too harshly. And we do want such a preparation, for that charming beauty is an egoist in the strictest sense of the word, knowing but one god, her pretty little self, and one law, the gratification of her vanity and her pleasure-craving nature. She belongs to "those plants that have hardly any roots: you may tear them out from their native nook of rock, or wall, and just lay them over your own ornamental flower-pot, and they blossom none the worse. Hetty could have cast all her past life behind her, and never cared to be reminded of it again."²⁾ Can we sympathise with this girl in whom egoism has killed all noble feelings, whose exterior so little corresponds to her interior? Scarcely! Yet G. Eliot shows us the same Hetty, suffering from the terrible consequences of her selfishness. This bewildered, most pathetic figure in prison is no longer the bright girl we used to see. Her deep misery, though chiefly brought about by her own guilt, moves us to the core and elevates her character. Our sympathy

¹⁾ Compare *Silas Marner*, p. 128.

²⁾ *Adam Bede*, p. 205, vol. I.

which her heartlessness has forfeited, is called back by her misfortune. We wish to be in Dinah's place to be able to say some kind words to the unhappy girl who is going to begin a new life in exile, a dreary and joyless life, haunted by the remembrance of a stain that cannot be washed away.

Hetty's character had, like that of Dinah, its germ in recollections of G. Eliot, but only its germ. Everything else was free invention. That it was masterly we feel especially when Hetty is relieved against Dinah, so when each of the girls is shown to us in her bedroom: Hetty in all her finery before her looking-glass, Dinah praying and meditating, or when the cousins meet in prison. The greater interest of most readers will probably be with selfish little Hetty; for the delineation of her character strikes us as more true to life.

"Mothers are made to like pain and trouble for the sake of their children," says little Mrs. Meyrick. We have seen how true this was in the case of several mothers. But G. Eliot also portrays a mother of quite a different character who lacks nearly all those qualities which make her our ideal in our infancy, our most confidential friend in the passionate periods of our lives, our best refuge in trouble, and our dearest remembrance of the happy time of our childhood when we have grown old. This mother is the Princess of Halm-Eberstein in *Daniel Deronda*. When she sees her son, from whom she had separated herself when he was a little child, for the first time after many years, she gives him, who up to now had not known his mother, the history of her life. Her father, an orthodox Jew, wanted to educate his motherless child according to the strict laws of his faith, and with a thousand "musts and must nots" he hemmed in the girl who had a passionate desire to do whatever she liked. She "who felt a man's genius" was obliged to suffer the slavery of being but a girl. She wanted to become a singer, but her father did not allow it, and his will was iron. He forced her to marry her cousin. Him she could rule, and so she could now realize the wish of her girlhood. She became one of the first singers of Europe, and lived a myriad of lives in one. After the early death of her husband she wished to free herself entirely from all ties and therefore asked one of her numerous admirers to adopt her child Daniel, and never to reveal to him who his parents were. Her life, however, turned out different from what she had expected. She began to lose her voice, and unable to endure the prospect of failure and decline she married the Prince Halm-Eberstein, making her friends believe that she preferred being the wife of a Russian nobleman to being the most renowned singer of her time. Her voice came back when marriage had bound her again, and she was obliged to live a commonplace life which she hated so much. She lived it, though, till a slow fatal illness seized her and brought back to her conscience the command of her father. to deliver to her son a chest containing his grandfather's documents. That and not a mother's love was her motive for seeing Daniel. The meeting is consequently formal and cold, and her parting words: "We shall hear no more of each other," show to her son only too well that near as this woman's life is to him by the ties of nature, there is yet scarcely any other so remote from him.

There is a certain resemblance between the behaviour of the Princess and that of Hetty as a mother. Neither has motherly feelings for her child, but regards it as a troublesome burden. But though Hetty's guilt is the greater, and though the motive of the Princess for her separation from Daniel, her ambition, is higher than the pettish vanity that form the basis of Hetty's action, we yet feel more repelled by the cold and deliberate way

in which the Princess gives away her only son, than by Hetty's crime which we know was not committed with full consciousness. But when we consider the unhappy and joyless childhood of the Princess, the disappointments of the years which followed, we can understand how it was possible that she became a bitter and unloving mother, and we feel less inclined to condemn her.

In Hetty G. Eliot delineated the egoism of a girl, in the Princess that of a mother. How a wife by her selfishness can paralyse the noble faculties of her husband is shown in the person of Rosamund Vincy in *Middlemarch*.

Rosamund, the eldest daughter of a Middlemarch manufacturer, a girl of great beauty, has been brought up in great luxury, got her education at one of the best schools and is regarded as "a rare compound of beauty, cleverness and amiability." Most of the young men fall in love with her. But Rosamund's taste is exquisite. None of her admirers corresponds to her ideal of a husband, till a young physician, Tertius Lydgate, settles at Middlemarch. He has talents and high aspirations, is the descendant of a good family, carries himself with a certain air of distinction, in short, is thoroughly refined. Such qualities strike Rosamund. He, and no other must become her husband. After a few months she is Mrs. Lydgate, and her husband thinks himself the happiest of all mortals. But alas! How soon was he to become aware that Rosamund's love is a love that

Seeketh only self to please,
To bind another to its delight,
Joys in another's loss of ease
And builds a hell in heaven's despite. ¹⁾

Lydgate's married life becomes a series of disappointments which have their roots in his wife's egoism. A real understanding between him and her never comes about. Each lives in a world of which the other knows nothing. No wonder, therefore, that Lydgate, in spite of his prosperous career, regarded himself as a failure. For he whose spirit was framed for the pursuit of great ends, who had a burning desire to become a reformer of his profession, was daily obliged to acknowledge the decay of his ardour and to state the paralysing influence upon his enthusiasm, exercised by the pettish egoism of Rosamund, "his basil plant," as he called her, that is a plant which had flourished wonderfully on a murdered man's brains."²⁾ Lydgate died early, and Rosamund afterwards married a rich physician who satisfied all her desires. She used to speak of her happiness as a reward, and though she never said what this reward was for, she was convinced that she had merited it by her great patience with Lydgate.

Rosamund's selfishness greatly differs from that of Daniel Deronda's mother. The Princess is perfectly clear about her egoism, and her means to attain her ends are straight ones. She does not excuse herself, nor does she want others to excuse her. Rosamund, however, is always sure that nobody can justly find fault with her, she herself least of all. What she likes to do is for her the right thing, and with so great cleverness does she manage to get the means for doing it that only those who come into closer contact with her, are able to see how shallow and heartless this beautiful creature is.

Mr. Cross, G. Eliot's second husband, tells us that of all the characters his wife had attempted, she found Rosamund's the most difficult to sustain, owing to the fact that such a nature was entirely alien to hers. But nevertheless

¹⁾ William Blake, *Songs of Experience*.

²⁾ *Middlemarch*, p. 618.

she well succeeded in gathering up "the unobtrusive but terribly potent promptings of a narrow egoism... into a convincing whole":¹⁾ Rosamund Vincy.

[To be continued.]

Gleiwitz, Upper Silesia.

MARIA E. KAWA.

The Dialectal Distribution of certain Phonological Features in Middle English.

Section II.

The *i*-mutation of $\bar{e}a$ in O.E. and M.E.

§ 78. The investigation of the geographical distribution of M.E. *u*, *i*, representing O.E. $\bar{e}a$ -*i*, is rendered somewhat difficult by the fact that we have to draw our conclusions from rather scanty material. The words which contain the vowel in question are few in number, and those which occur as Pl.-N. elements are fewer still. In dealing with other phonological features of M.E. dialects we can usually collect at least some hundreds of examples, from which fairly satisfactory conclusions can often be drawn. But although we are chiefly concerned here with the south-western counties, which possess some of the most extensive and most easily accessible 12th—15th century records, it is extremely difficult to find in each county even two or three Pl.-Ns. which illustrate the phonological development here dealt with.

Examination of the O.E. charters does not lead to any more definite results, though the Pl. N. material is occasionally supplemented by independent words occurring in the few English charters which we possess. But as in other cases, the appearance of W. Saxon types in O.E. written documents from counties which can scarcely have used these types in the spoken language, renders a difficult problem still more involved. When, for instance, we find a 10th century Cambridge charter writing *gehyrsum* and *âlysednesse*, and *hÿrð* appearing in an 11th century Staffs. charter, we can hardly take these seriously. However, the small body of material given below does at least give some indication as to the position of the boundary between those counties which in O.E. had \bar{e} as the *i*-mutation of $\bar{e}a$ and those which had $\bar{i}e$.

§ 79. General view.

The counties that seem to have had O.E. $\bar{i}e$ for $\bar{e}a$ -*i* are the following: Hants. (§ 80), Dorset (§ 81), Devon (§ 82), Somerset (§ 83), Wilts. (§ 84), probably Berks. (§ 85), possibly Gloucester (§ 86) after the 9th century. Middlesex (§ 87) apparently used both the $\bar{i}e$ and the *e*-type. Kent and Sussex, Suffolk, Surrey, Worcester, certainly belonged to the \bar{e} -area (§ 89). Northants. (§ 88) has only \bar{y} spellings, but these may very well not represent the genuine dialect form.

In M.E. what evidence there is points to practically the same boundary. It is almost impossible to trace the line of division between the area which levelled $\bar{i}e$ under \bar{i} in E.W.S., and that which retained the diphthong until L.W.S. and then rounded it to [y]. The [y]-type is by far the more common. M.E. forms suggest Berks. as the centre of the \bar{i} -type.

¹⁾ J. Oliphant, *Victorian Novelists*, p. 127.

The following paragraphs give the Pl.-N. material for each county, supplemented where possible by forms from literary texts. It seems best to give the O.E. and M.E. evidence together. Since the [ȳ]-boundary is almost identical in the two periods, the one serves to illustrate the other.

§ 80. Hampshire. This county certainly had [ȳ] for the \bar{i} -mutation of $\bar{e}a$ in L.W.S. It appears as early as the last quarter of the 9th century, when King Alfred's will (880—5), Kemble 314, has *hyran*, *hyraþ*, *gehyran*, *gehyrde*. A 10th century charter (Birch 1066) has *hlȳpe burnan*. Ælfric's *Lives of Saints* has \bar{y} , with \bar{i} sometimes before a front cons. (Schüller: *Lautl. von Aelfric's L. of S.* p. 21); the *Grammar* has \bar{y} with a very occasional \bar{e} (Brüll: *die altengl. Lat.-Gr. des Ælfric*, p. 20).

Two hundred years later, the Egerton M.S. of the *Moral Ode* (c. 1200) has both *u* and *e*: *ileue*, *ileueð*, *ileuen*, *vneþe*, — *ihuren*, *i-hurd*, *alused*. The 12th century Codex Wintoniensis generally writes \bar{y} (*hȳrð*, *gehyran*, *cypinge*, etc.), apparently copying the spelling from earlier documents. The Crondal Court Roll of 1281-2 has the personal name *Chupmann*. In the 14th century Hants. has *u*, *i*, and *e*: *Lupstones crofte* (Crondal Rec. 90; O.E. *hlēpe*) — *hyrd(e)* (Lib. de Hyda 56³); *Prestlyp* (Lib. de Hyda 107, 108) — here (Lib. de Hyda 70). The *Usages of Winchester* have only one example: *herd* (*English Gilds*, p. 359). Apparently the [ȳ]-type was dying out in the spoken dialect by this time, though still surviving in the Place-Names.

§ 81. Dorset. The earliest example of *y* for $\bar{e}a$ -*i* is in an 11th century charter: *gelyfe* (vb) Kemble 942.

In the M.E. period we find the form *stupel* (O.E. *stīepel* 'steeple') fairly often in Pl.Ns. It is rarely spelt with *i* and only once with *e*. 13th cent. F.A. II (1285) *stupel*- (2); *stypel*- (3). H.R. I (1275) *stupel* (1). 14th cent. F.A. II (1316—46) *stupel*- (9); *stepel* (1). Brit. Mus. Add. 221; 222 (1399): *stupel* (2).

§ 82. Devon.

In the 10th century only *y* is used for $\bar{e}a$ -*i*: *hlypan* (Napier II 14²; 34). The 11th century documents (chiefly manumissions) printed by Earle in the *Land-Charters* from the *Leofric Missal* have 5 *i*-forms to 3 *y*: *alisde*; *alisednesse*, *-nisse* (3); *cipa*; — *alysde* (2); *lysde*. As soon as O.E. $\bar{i}e$ became \bar{y} , it naturally shared the development of the other O.E. \bar{y} (that from Pr. O.E. \bar{u} -*i*); the latter seems to have been unrounded in Late O.E. in the dialect of part of the country at least (§ 119). The *i*-forms given above (for $\bar{e}a$ -*i*) are more probably due to this unrounding than to the spread of the *i*-type from another dialect, since none of the neighbouring counties has anything but \bar{y} .

§ 83. Somerset. In an 11th century charter given by Earle (C.C. C.C. 140) occurs the form *hyrsumien*. In the following century *u* is the usual spelling: The Liber Hen. de Soliaco (1189) has only *-u*: *de luphiet* (O.E. *hlȳpgeat*); *lupihiet*; *lupehiet* (2). The 12th century M.S. of the Chartulary of Bath Priory has *u*, *i* and *e*: *lupyet* (2); *hlipgete*; *lepegeate*.

§ 84. Wiltshire. The O.E. charters have \bar{y} and $\bar{i}e$, but no trace of *i*-forms. Kemble 328 (after 900): *lyfde*; *gehyrdan*; *flyman*. Kemble 3536 (after 931): *gehieraþ* (3). Kemble 421 (939): *bymera*. Kemble 1290 (995): *gelyfð* (2).

Both *u* and *i*-forms are used in the 13th century; in the 14th century, *u*

is the usual spelling, but *e* occurs also. For the 15th century I have found an equal number of *u* and *e*-forms.

13th cent. Cal. Inq. *Stupel*- (2); *chuppe*- (2). Cat. Anc. Dds. *Chippe*- (4).

14th cent. F.A. V *Stupul*- (1); *Chup*- (1); *Steppul*- (1). Malm. Reg. *Lupe*- (4); *Stepel*- (1).

15th cent. F.A. V (1428): *Stupul*- (5); *Stepel*- (4).

§ 85. Berkshire. I have no material for this county for the O.E. period. Fortunately the forms in the 12th century Abingdon Chartulary fix the type pretty definitely. According to Langer (*Zur Sprache des Abingdon Chartulars*) the regular spelling is *i*; *u* occurs once only, *e* occasionally before *ȝ*.

If the original Berkshire type were *y* as in Hampshire, the Abingdon *i* would represent an E.M.E. unrounding from *y*. If such an unrounding had taken place it must have included O.E. *y* from *u-i*; but we know that the latter vowel remained in M.E. in Berks (§ 119), therefore the Abingdon *i* cannot have developed from *y*, but must be the original O.E. type. Since this is the only county where the existence of the *i*-type can be established, it may be suggested that the *i*-forms which are such a typical feature of the writings of Alfred may have originated in this dialect, the king himself being a native of Berkshire.

§ 86. Gloucester. The 9th century charter (Kemble 243—c. 840) writes *e*: *hernisse*. This charter is decidedly Non-W.S. in character, and seems to represent the earlier dialect of the county. By the 10th century many W.S. features have crept in, among them being the W.S. *īe* for *ēa-i*. In the 10th cent. charters 2 *īe*, 2 *y*, 1 *i* are found. Kemble 426 (949): *hirð*; *hyrð*. Kemble 385 (940): *hierp* (2). Kemble 692 (995): *aflȳmde*.

The 13th century Pl. Ns. indicate the *i*-type: *Digelecroft* (Glos. Cart. III 70); *Lippehiete* (Berkeley Mun. 84. c. 1238); but *Robert of Glos.* uses no *i*-forms; he generally writes *e* (*stepel*, *ȝeme*, *fleme*, *leue*, etc.), and occasionally *u* (*yhure*, *hurd*, etc.). Trevisa writes both *u* (*uy*) and *y* (Pfeffer: *Die Spr. des Polych. John Trevisas*, Tiberius M.S.) the former being the commoner. Pfeffer gives the following examples: *hure* (inf.) (3); *hurde* (4) pret.; *yhurd* (4) p.p.; *ihurd* (1) pret.; *huyred* (3); *huyre* (3); *hyre* (1); *hyrep* (1); *hyryng* (1); *yche* 'increase' (1).

Since forms of Pl. Ns. are often more archaic than literary documents, it is possible that the *ī*-forms are the older type, introduced into Glos. in the O.E. period from Berks. (? through Oxford), while the *u*-forms are the result of the spread of the more southern [y]-type at a later date.

§ 87. Middlesex. This county has both *īe* and *ē* for *ēa-i*. The earliest form is *ȳ*: *hyrdð* Birch 1085 (962). The 11th cent. charters have only *e*: *herp* Kemble 886; *alesednysse*, *flemenefȳrmðe* Earle p. 302-3. The two types must have coexisted, however, since both appear in the M.E. period. The early London Documents seem to have *ȳ*: *ȳȝe*, *hrisyȝe*, *alysednesse*, *alisendnesse* (Dölle: *Zur Sprache Londons vor Chaucer*, p. 37). The Trinity Homilies have one example of *u* beside the usual *e* (Wyld: *Essays and Studies* VI p. 139). Davy's *Dreams* (c. 1310) has only *here*, *stel*. The [y]-type had apparently died out by this time; this is not surprising, as Middlesex is practically surrounded by *ē*-counties, Essex, Kent, Bucks. (?), Surrey. (For the last county see Wyld: *English Studies* Vol. III No. 2. p. 3.). Bucks. has only *e* in M.E. Place-Names: *Stepel Cleystone*, etc.

§ 88. Northampton. If the forms in the 10th and 11th century charters are genuine (Kemble 399 (944): *hindehlypan* (2). Kemble 736 (1021-3): *hindehlype* 2) and represent the pronunciation then in use in the local dialect, this type must have disappeared very early, since *e* is the only spelling used in the later part of the *Laud Chronicle* (1122-54): *stepel*, *aflemdon*, *begemen*, *herdon*, etc.

§ 89. *e*-counties. Sussex has *hērþ* in the 11th century: Kemble 732 (1016-20).

Kent has only *ê*-forms: *herap* Birch 536 (873); *beleuap* Kemble 737 (1023).

The early Suffolk charters have *gæhyrð*, *geherap* (Sweet 2nd Reader. Ch. 45, 46). The latter must be the genuine dialect form. Worcester has *e* with one example of *y*: 10th cent. Sweet: 2nd Reader ch. 31 (904): *hernisse*. 11th century. Kemble 804 (1049-58): *gehersume*. Kemble 898: *hærð*. Kemble 676: *hersumnesse*. Kemble 675: *hyrsumnesse*.

The only M.E. Place-Names I have found are *Hyndelep* Worcs. Reg. 366, 151a (13th cent.). *Lazamon* (Early M.S.) has usually *e*: *fleman*; *zemen*; *heren*; *herde*; *ileue*; *alesen*; etc. Both *i* and *u*-forms occur, but are very rare: *ihire* (1); *ihire* (1); *hirde* (1); *ihirde* (1); *bi-liueð* (1); *diȝelnesse* (1); *diȝenliche* (1). — *hure* (1); *ihurde* (1); *ihurden* (2).

Section III.

O.E. *eo* in the M.E. dialects of the south and west.

§ 90. The O.E. diphthong *eo*, whether long or short, became [e] in M.E. in the eastern counties and most of the northern and central midlands. The *e* appears very early in some districts: Suffolk, in an 11th century charter (Sweet: 2nd Reader. ch. 46) has *derast*, *werð*. An 11th century manumission from Herts. has *ātenne* (Kemble 1352). But in the west midlands and south-west the diphthong *eo* had a different development. At least as early as the end of the 11th century it seems to have been rounded and monophthongised to [ø], and perhaps subsequently raised to [y]. The rounded type remained as such through the 13th and 14th centuries, and in some counties even into the 15th century, when it was finally ousted by the northern and eastern *e*. The western type is represented in M.E. texts and Pl. Ns. by the spellings *u*, *ue*, *o*, *eo*, *oe*, all of which seem to imply some degree of rounding. The *eo*-forms are particularly common in literary documents of the west-midlands; the *eo*-spelling is never used in these texts to represent the ordinary mid-front vowel, and therefore probably indicates a rounded pronunciation.

Practically all the documents which have *u*, *o*, etc. have also a large number of *e*-forms, probably owing to the influence of official scribes; and this habit of writing *e* where a rounded vowel was apparently pronounced may have helped on the spread of the *e*-type in pronunciation. But the *u*-forms are frequent enough to enable us to discover with some degree of certainty the area over which the rounded pronunciation obtained. We need have no hesitation in assuming that where *u* is written the rounded vowel was pronounced, and though on the outskirts of the *u*-area the *e*-type was probably more widespread, the occurrence of *u*-spellings shows that the *u*-type was known to, and at least occasionally employed by the speakers of the local dialect.

§ 91. The following counties were certainly within the *u*-area: Hampshire, Dorset, Devon, Somerset, Wilts., Berks, Oxford, Gloucester and Hereford. Names of places in these counties occur with *u*-spellings pretty frequently in 13th and 14th century documents.

In Hampshire (§ 100) the *u*-forms are more numerous than the *e*-forms in the 13th and 14th centuries, but by the 15th century they have almost disappeared. In the Egerton M.S. of the *Moral Ode* (c. 1200. This M.S. is believed to have been written in Hants.) the usual spelling is *eo*; *e* is often used, and *ue*, *u* are fairly common. The 14th century *Usages of Winchester* have generally *e*, but *u*-forms also occur. (§ 100).

In Dorset (§ 101) the *u*-forms are less common; the 14th century material shows that this county was within the *u*-area; lying as it does between Devon and Hants, it must in any case be expected to have shared their development in this respect, and the fact that no *u*-forms appear in the 13th century is probably due to lack of material.

Devonshire (§ 102) has a larger proportion of *u* to *e*-forms than any other county. Here too they seem to survive longest, for a few occur as late as 1447-50 in the letters of John Shillingford, Mayor of Exeter. Shillingford's use of *u*-forms is striking, both because his writing does not often show the influence of Regional Dialect, and because we have no other examples of *u* so late as this in any literary documents, though in Pl. Ns. the *u*-type survives rather longer.

Wilts. (§ 104) has besides *u* a number of *oe* and *eo* spellings, particularly in the 14th century Malmesbury Register. The rounded type must have been very firmly implanted in the dialect of this county, for even in the 15th century the Wiltshire poem of *St. Editha* (c. 1420) has many examples of *u*-forms: *hulde* (O.E. *heold*); *bude* (O.E. *beodan*); *dure* (O.E. *deore*); *vrthe* (O.E. *eorða*); *furre* (O.E. *feorr*); etc.

Berkshire (§ 105) has more *u* than *e*-spellings in the 14th century, but in the 15th century *u* is very rare. In Oxford (§ 106) the *u*-forms seem to have vanished as early as the 14th century.

In Gloucester (§ 107) *u* remains till the 15th century. Robert of Gloucester's *Chronicle* (14th cent. M.S.) has numbers of *u*-forms, such as *bihulde* (O.E. *biheold*); *chuse* (O.E. *ceosan*); *dup* (O.E. *deop*); *dure* (O.E. *deor*); *vrl* (O.E. *eorl*); *furpe* (O.E. *feorða*).

Trevisa (Pfeffer: *Die Spr. des Polychr.*, §§ 81, 101-108) has *e*, *eo*, *eu*, *u*, *ue*: *fer*; *ver*; *sterres*; *derk*; *hert*; *deuel*; *lever*; *vel* 'fell'; *prest*; *peves*, etc. — *leorne*; *eorþ*; *deop*; *þeof*; *leovere*, etc. — *leurne*; *yleurned*; etc. — *huerdes*; *luernede*; *duepe*; *þueves*; *pruest*; *luef*; etc. — *lurneþ*; *lurnede*; *huld*; *ful*; *vulle*; *brust*; *lup*; *dupe*; *prust*, etc.

In Hereford (§ 108) *u* is rare in Pl. Ns., but *u* and *ue* are very frequent in the English poems of MS. Harley 2253 (written at Leominster, c. 1310): *buen* (O.E. *beon*); *huld* (O.E. *heold*); *duere* (O.E. *deore*); *huerte* (O.E. *heort*); *pruest* (O.E. *preost*); etc.

§ 92. Besides the counties enumerated above, which belong definitely to the *u*-area, there are others, bordering on these, which show traces of *u*-forms. This is only to be expected, as the *u*-boundary naturally did not in all cases coincide with the county boundaries. In these outlying districts the *u*-forms are confined to names of places on or near the border-line of a real *u*-county. I have not been able to discover any examples of the rounded type in the border-counties of Warwick and Northants., but it

seems to have existed as at least a possible pronunciation in certain parts of Shropshire, Worcs., Bucks., Surrey, and perhaps Sussex.

§ 93. Shropshire (§ 109) has a 13th century form *Faintru* (mod. Faintree); this village is in the S.E. corner of the county, near the border of Herefordshire.

§ 94. In Worcester (§ 110), the Severn was perhaps the boundary. The 13th century Worcester Register has one *u*-form: *furthendello* (O.E. *feorða*), and several *o*-forms. The earlier M.S. of *Lagamon* (said to have been composed at Arley Kings, N.W. Worcs.) has usually *eo* for O.E. *ě*. There are also a fair number of *u*-forms, and about the same number of *e*-forms. *ě* is always used before a back consonant, apparently from an O.E. type with smoothing. A few *o*-spellings appear for both the long and the short vowel.

§ 95. In Buckingham (§ 111) the *u*-forms appear in the name of one place only — Hertwell in S.W. Bucks., near the Oxford border. This appears as *Hurtwelle* in 13th and 14th century documents, though *Hertwelle* is the more usual form.

§ 96. It does not seem possible that the *u*-type can ever have been used as far east as Herts., and there are a few P.I.N. forms from this county which are difficult to explain. I have noted, for instance, at least one example of *Burkhamstede* (for Berkhamstead) in a Buckinghamshire manuscript in the British Museum. More striking is the form *Hurtford*, which occurs among the signatures to the *Proclamation of Henry III* (1258). Also *Hvrtfortscr* or *Hurtfscr* is rather a favourite spelling for Hertfordshire in some of the volumes of Pipe Rolls. It would be rather far-fetched to imagine a western scribe for each of these documents, and the problem cannot be definitely solved without further examination of Hertfordshire material.

§ 97. From Hampshire the *u*-forms certainly spread eastward into West Surrey (§ 112). This is proved by 13th, 14th, and 15th century forms of P.I. Ns. from the S. W. of the county, and by a few independent words in the 13th century Chertsey Chartulary (*e* is more usual than *u* in the P.I. Ns.; the Chartulary generally has *ě*, but *e* and *u* occasionally). The West Surrey poem *The Owl and the Nightingale* has four rhymes which illustrate this point: in lines 66, 849, 1673, *cunne* (from O.E. *y*) rhymes with *heonne* (Cotton MS. *honne*); in line 863 *sunne* (O.E. *synn*) rhymes with *heonne* (O.E. *heonan*), showing that *eo* here represents a rounded vowel. (See on this point, Wyld: *Essays and Studies* VI p.p. 139-142; *English Studies*, Vol. III, No. 2).

§ 98. It is possible that the *u*-forms penetrated also into part of West Sussex. I have noted from 14th and 15th century MSS. in the British Museum the Sussex P.I. Ns. *Feningetru*, *Buntesgraue* (§ 113), and these forms may indicate a variation from the *e*-type which was normal in Sussex; but they are not very satisfactory evidence. I have not been able to discover the modern names of these places, but apparently they were in the west of the county.

§ 99. The *u*-forms appear also, strangely enough, in Lancashire. This seems to be a genuine *u*-area, though isolated from that of the south-west. I have not as yet found any trace of *u*-forms in Cheshire or in North Shropshire. Only the *u*-spellings from Lancashire documents are given below (§ 114); the *e*-forms are decidedly more common.

§ 100. Hampshire. 13th cent. H.R. II (1273-83): *Dur-* (2); *Berk-* (1). Crondal Rec. *Dupe-* (6); *hurt-* (2); *sturte* (2) (O.E. *steort*).

14th cent. Crondal Rec. *Hurt-* (4); *Dupe-* (5); *sturte-* (3). F.A. II (1316-46): *Dupe-* (6); *Dur-* (1); *Url-* (2); *Burk-* (1); *Hurt-* (2); *Nuther-* (1); *Bunet-* (1) (O.E. *beonet*); — *Prest-* (2); *Hert-* (3); *Nether-* (1); *Cherl-* (1). Lib. de Hyda: *Hort-* (1); — *Der-* (1); *Nether-* (2); *by-nethe* (1); *lefyst* (1); *-thef* (2).

15th cent. F.A. II (1428): *Hurt-* (1); — *Dep-* (5); *Prest-* (1); *Hert-* (2). *Moral Ode* (M.S. Egerton): *iben*; *heune*; *beð*; *lef*; *leue*; *leure*; *þeve*; *dere*; *swere* 'neck'. — *beo*; *beon*; *beoþ*; *deofel*; *deofles*; *beode*; *heolden*. — *bo*; *frond*; *dore*. — *bue*; *buen*; *bueþ*; *buð*; *durlinges*.

Usages of Winchester: *chese*; *lese*; *freleche*; *beth*; *erthe*; *ferþyng*e. — *buþ*; *furpe*.

§ 101. Dorset. 13th cent. F.A. II (1285): *Cherl-* (2); *Stert-* (3); *Nether-* (1). 14th cent. F.A. II. *Dure-* (3); *-tru* (1); *sturt-* (2) (O.E. *steort*); *Nuther-* (1). — *Prest-* (2); *-tre* (2); *Nether-* (3); *Cherl-* (2); *Hert-* (1). Cerne Cart. *Nuther-* (1). — *Deouele-* (2); *Heort-* (1).

§ 102. Devon. 13th cent. F.A. I (1284-6): *Dup-* (1); *Hurt-* (1); *Chulme-* (1) (O.E. *Ceolmund*); *-truwe* (2). — *Der-* (1); *Hert-* (2); *-tre* (2). H.R. I (1274-5): *Dup-* (4); *Chulme-* (O.E. *Ceolmund-*) (3). — *Depe-* (1); *Hert-* (6); *Bever-* (2). Reg. Bron. *Dupe-* (1); *Dure-* (1). — *Dep-* (1).

14th cent. F.A. I (1303-46): *Dupe-* (8); *Pruste-* (2); *Chulme-* (1); *-tru* (2); *Hurt-* (1); *Churl-* (5); *Furth-* (3). — *Hert-* (11); *Cherl-* (1); *-trewe* (11). Reg. Brant. *Dup-* (3); *Dur-* (6); *Prust-* (1); *Hurt-* (2); *Churl-* (2). — *Prest-* (4); *-tre* (4); *Hert-* (5); *Cherl-* (2). From MSS. in the Brit. Mus. *Dup-* (1); *Churl-* (3); *Hurt-* (11). — *Cherl-* (1).

15th cent. From M.S.S. in the Brit. Mus. *Dup-* (1); *Churl-* (1). — *Cherl-* (1). Shillingford (1447-50) (Cam. Soc., 1871) has the following *u*-spellings: *durer* 'dearer' (1); *buth* 'are' (34).

§ 103. Somerset. 12th cent. Lib. Hen. de Sol. (1189): *-stuert* (2). 13th cent. H.R. II (1273-6): *Dur-* (2); *Nuther-* (4). — *Der-* (1); *Cherl-* (1). F.A. IV *Prest-* (1); *Der-* (2); *Cherl-* (4).

14th cent. Bath Cart. Linc. M.S. *Dur-* (1). — *Dep-* (1); *Cherl-* (7). F.A. IV *Dur-* (3). — *Prest-* (2); *Cherl-* (4) *Berk-* (4); *Nether-* (4). From M.S.S. in Brit. Mus. *Hurt-* (2); *Nuthur-* (1). Mon. Sec. Ind. (1350): *Nether-* (2); *Hert* (1); *-sterie* (8).

15th cent. F.A. IV (1428): *Dure-* (2). — *Nether-* (1).

§ 104. Wiltshire. 12th cent. Lib. H. de Sol. (1189): *-true* (1); *sturte* (2). 13th cent. Sar. Reg. *Dup-* (1); *Nuther-* (2). — *Prest-* (1); *Der-* (1); *Nether-* (1). Cat. Anc. Dds. III *-storte* (2). — *Nether-* (3).

14th cent. Malm. Reg. *Hurt-* (1). — *Choerl-* (5); *Stoerte* (1); *Noether-* (1). — *Choerl-* (1); *Heort-* (3); *-steorte* (3). — *Prest-* (1); *Cherl-* (40); *Nether-* (2); *Stert-* (1).

§ 105. Berkshire. 14th cent. Abing. Obed. *Duyr-* (2). F.A. I *Hurt-* (1). Hurl.-Chart. *Nuthere-* (3). — *Benet-* (1); *Nethere-* (1). F.A. I *Cherl-* (2). From M.S.S. in the Brit. Mus. *Hurt-* (3).

15th cent. F.A. I (1428): *Hurt-* (1); — *Hert-* (2); *Cherl-* (1).

§ 106. Oxford. 12th cent. Eynsh. Cart. *Dup-* (1); *Churl-* (1). — *Cherl-* (7). 13th cent. Eynsh. Cart. *-sturte* (1). — *Der-* (1); *Prest-* (2); *Cherl-* (13); *Nether-* (3). H.R. II *Pruste-* (2); *Nuther-* (6); — *Cherl-* (1).

14th cent. Eynsh. Cart. *Prest-* (1); *Nether-* (1); *Cherl-* (2).

§ 107. Gloucester. 12th cent. Lib. H. de S. -*true* (1).
13th cent. Glos. Cart. *Dur-* (2). — *Dep-* (1); *Der-* (1); *Prest-* (15); *Benet-* (1); *Cherl-* (2); *Nether-* (1). F.A. II *Dur-* (2). — *Dere-* (1). H.R. I *Der-* (2); *Nether-* (2).

14th cent. F.A. II *Dur-* (7); — *Der-* (4).

15th cent. F.A. II *Dur-* (1). — *Der-* (1). Glos. Hist. *Hert-* (1); *Cherl-* (2).

§ 108. Hereford. 12th cent. Brit. Mus. Addit. 19594 (1158-1164): *Hurt-* (1).

13th cent. Reg. T. de C. *Prest-* (18); *Cherl-* (1).

14th cent. F.A. II *Hurt-* (3). — *Prest-* (3); *Nether-* (3).

15th cent. F.A. II *Hurt-* (2). — *Prest-* (3); *Nether-* (4).

§ 109. Shropshire. 13th cent. H.R. II (1254-73): -*tru* (1); — *Prest-* (5); -*tre* (5); *Cherl-* (1); *Nether-* (1); *Benet-* (3); *Hert-* (2). F.A. IV *Prest-* (2); -*tre* (3).

14th cent. F.A. IV. *Prest-* (2); -*tre* (1).

§ 110. Worcester. 13th cent. Worcs. Reg. *Rud-* (1). — *Dor-* (3); *Horde-* (17); *Hort-* (1); *Storte-* (7); -*trowe* (1). — *Bever-* (6); *Berk-* (1); *Cherl-* (7); *Erth-* (1); *Herde-* (6); *Nether-* (12); *Depe-* (1); -*tre* (1).

14th cent. F.A. V (1346): *Rud-* (1). — *Benet-* (1); *Cherl-* (1); *Hert-* (1); *Bee-* (1) O.E. *beo*; -*tre* (1).

15th cent. F.A. V. (1428): *Bu-* (1); *Rud-* (1). — *Beo-* (1). — *Bent-* (2); *Cherl-* (3); *Hert-* (3); *Nethur-* (1); -*tre* (2).

§ 111. Buckingham. 13th cent. F.A. I (1284-6): *Hurt-* (1). — *Prest-* (5); *Chelmond-* (1); *Nether-* (1). H.R. I *Hert-* (2).

14th cent. From a M.S. in the Brit. Mus. *hurt-* (3). — *hert-* (4); *depe-* (3); *prest-* (7). F.A. I: *Hert-* (5); *Prest-* (4).

§ 112. Surrey. (*u*-forms only are given here). 13th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Hurt-* (7). — *Hort-* (1). Chert. Cart. *nuder* (1); *binude-* (2); *duef* (1). — *frond-* (1).

14th cent. Cal. Inq. *Hurt-* (1).

15th cent. F.A. I (1428): *Hurt-* (1).

§ 113. Sussex. (*u*-forms only). 14th cent. From a M.S. in the Brit. Mus.: -*true* (2).

15th cent. From a M.S. in the Brit. Museum: *Buntes-* (6) (O.E. *beonet-*).

§ 114. Lancashire. 13th cent. Lancashire Inquests: -*true* (2); *Hurt-* (1). Cockersand Chartulary: *Dur-* (6). Lancs. Pipe Rolls: *Dupe-* (1). Chart. of the Priory of Lancaster: *Nuther-* (1) (O.E. *neodor*).

[To be concluded in the next number.]

Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford.

MARY S. SERJEANTSON.

Translation M. O. 1921.

Het is altijd een van mijn zwagers vurigste wenschen geweest een zeereis te doen naar Indië op een van de groote Nederlandsche mailbooten. Het is hoogst onwaarschijnlijk, dat die wensch ooit vervuld zal worden. Indien hij mocht besluiten thans te gaan, zou hij zijn betrekking moeten vaarwel zeggen zonder gerechtigd te zijn tot pensioen, aangezien zijn gezondheid

hem, menschelijkerwijze gesproken, in staat zal stellen nog vele jaren het aan zijn ambt van postdirecteur verbonden werk te verrichten. En op vijf en zestigjarigen leeftijd zal hij misschien bij zich zelf denken, dat hij maar beter doet stilletjes in het vaderland te blijven, nog afscheiden van de vraag, of hij zijn vrouw, die op al zijn vakantie-uitstapjes zijn onafscheidelijke reisgenootte is geweest, zou kunnen bewegen hem te vergezellen. Het leven aan boord van zulk een groot, drijvend hotel als de hedendaagsche mailbooten zijn, schijnt hem uitermate verrukkelijk toe. Hij houdt hartstochtelijk veel van de zee, misschien omdat hij in een dorpje aan de Hollandsche kust geboren is. Hij herinnert zich levendig, hoe hij, op een duin gezeten, uren lang kon zitten turen naar de golven, die braken op het strand, of naar den verwijderden horizon, waar nu en dan een zeil of een rookwolk zichtbaar werd van een of ander voorbijvarend schip. Het kostte hem altijd veel moeite zich los te rukken van dit schijnbaar eentonige, maar in werkelijkheid steeds afwisselende schouwspel, en wanneer hij eindelijk de zee den rug toekeerde, voelde hij zich, alsof hij afscheid genomen had van een dierbaren vriend. Waarom is hij dan geen zeeman geworden? zult gij vragen. Indien hij zijn eigen zin had kunnen volgen, zou hij zonder twijfel naar zee gegaan zijn, zooals velen van zijn schoolmakkers, zelfs toen bleek, dat hij sommige kleuren niet voldoende kon onderscheiden wat hem belet zou hebben op te klimmen tot den rang van stuurman of kapitein. Zijn vader wierp echter zooveel bezwaren op, en alleen de gedachte er aan bedroefde zijn moeder zoozeer, dat hij om hunnentwil een betrekking koos, die hem nooit aan de gevaren van het zeemansleven zou kunnen blootstellen. Ieder jaar heeft hij een maand vakantie, die hij bij voorkeur op een van onze rustige badplaatsen aan zee doorbrengt. Het toppunt van genot evenwel zou voor hem zijn een reis van eenige weken te doen als eerste klasse passagier van een der schitterend ingerichte booten van onze groote scheepvaartmaatschappijen. Bij mooi weer zou hij den ganschen dag op het dek zitten, de frissche zeelucht inademend, gezellig pratende met medepassagiers, een lievelings-schrijver lezend, en heel dikwijls dromerig kijkend in de verte. Bij stormachtig weer zou hij aan dek blijven en met ontzag de reusachtige golven gadeslaan. Hij zou ze niet vreezen: hij kent ze van zijn jeugd af; hij zou zich even veilig voelen als thuis in zijn woonkamer.

It has always been one of the most ardent wishes of my brother-in-law to make a voyage to the (Dutch) East Indies on one of the large Dutch mailsteamers. It is most improbable that this ¹⁾ wish will ever be fulfilled. If he decided (should decide) to go now he would have (will have) to resign his post without being entitled to a pension, as, humanly speaking, his health will enable him for many years to come to do the work connected with his office of postmaster. And at the age of sixty-five he will perhaps think within himself that he had better stay quietly in his native country, apart from the question if he would be able to persuade his wife who has been his inseparable (constant) companion on all his holiday-trips, to accompany him. Life on board such a large floating hotel as the modern mailsteamers are (as m. are nowadays), seems exceedingly delightful to him. He is passionately fond of the sea, perhaps because he was born in a village on the Dutch coast. He remembers vividly how, seated on a dune, he would sit for hours gazing at the waves breaking on the beach, or that the distant horizon, where now and then a sail or a cloud of smoke of some

¹⁾ not *that*.

passing ship became (would become) visible. It was always very difficult for him to tear himself away from this seemingly monotonous, but in reality ever varying (changing) spectacle (scene), and when he at last turned his back upon the sea, he felt as if he parted from a dear friend. Why then did not he become a sailor? you will ask. If he had been able to have his own way (If he could have had h. o. w.), he would undoubtedly have gone to sea, like many of his schoolfellows, even when it appeared that he could not sufficiently distinguish some colours, which would have prevented him from rising to the rank of mate or captain. His father, however, raised so many objections, and the mere thought (of it) grieved his mother so much, that for their sake he chose a profession (calling) which could never expose him to the dangers of a sailor's life. Every year he has a month's holiday which he spends by preference at one of our quiet seaside places. The acme of delight (enjoyment) for him, however, would be to make a voyage of some weeks as a first class passenger of one of the splendidly appointed (equipped) boats of our large (big) steamship (shipping) companies. On fine days he would sit on deck all day, inhaling the fresh sea-air, chatting pleasantly with fellow-passengers, reading a favourite author, and often looking dreamily at the distance. In stormy weather he would remain on deck and watch with awe the huge waves. He would not fear them: he has known them from his youth; he would feel as safe as at home in his sitting-room.

Notes and News.

A Pilgrimage to the Remains of Shelley and Keats (1822(I)—1922).

On one of the days of July of this year we — two friends of mine and I — came from the splendid Basilica di S. Paolo fuori le mura (outside the Porta S. Paola or Porta Ostiense, one of the southern gates of Rome) and went to the quiet Cimitero Protestante, in the shadow of the wall of Aurelianus and the Pyramid of Caius Sestius. No other visitors were there. A little arrow points to the grave of Shelley, another to that of Keats. The fact that it was just a century after Shelley's untimely death when I approached his grave, deepened the impression it all made on me when I stood before the final resting-place of that unquiet spirit, and read the inscription which itself breathes Shelley's spirit:

Nothing of him that doth fade
But doth suffer a sea-change
Into something rich and strange.

By his side the grave of his friend Edward Trelawney, "ce beau débris du romantisme héroïque, ce vieux corsaire qui accompagna Byron en Grèce et présida aux funérailles antiques de Shelley."¹⁾ The inscription on his tomb-stone runs:

These are two friends, whose lives were undivided;
So let their memory be, now they have glided
Under the grave: let not their bones be parted,
For their two hearts in life were single-hearted.

From Shelley and his friend we walked to Keats and his friend Severn, in that solitary nook of the old cemetery. How touching, that these two poets, who trod such lonely paths in life, should each of them be accompanied by a true friend even after death.

¹⁾ *L'Oeuvre de Swinburne* par Paul de Reul. Bruxelles, 1922.

"This grave", I read, "contains all that was mortal of a young English poet, who, on his death-bed, in the bitterness of his heart, at the malicious power of his enemies, desired these words to be engraven on his tomb stone:

"Here lies one
Whose name was writ in water"
Feb. 24th 1821.

A tablet in the wall close to Keats's grave, bears an inscription which gives in its first two lines a beautiful, heart-felt answer to the poet's complaint, which makes us happily forget the ugliness of the lines that follow:

Keats, if thy cherished name be "writ in water",
Each drop has fallen from some mourner's cheek,
A sacred tribute, such as heroes seek,
Though oft in vain — for dazzling deeds of slaughter.
Sleep on! Not honoured less for epitaph so meek. —

The next day we visited the Keats-Shelley Memorial House in the Piazza di Spagna, to the right of the Spanish steps leading to Santa Trinità dei Monti. On the first floor there are two rooms, a sitting-room and a bed-room, in which Keats lived and suffered, and breathed his last, tended by Severn, and listening to the music of the murmuring waters of the historic and picturesque Bernini fountain in the Piazza.

On the 23rd of February 1903, eight American writers then in Rome, organized informally a movement "to purchase by popular subscription", as it said in the circular in which money was asked for the carrying out of the plan, "the house on the Piazza di Spagna in which John Keats lived and died, and to establish therein a permanent memorial of Keats and Shelley, consisting of a library of their works in various editions, portraits and manuscripts of the poets, etc., the trustees of the memorial to have also perpetual guardianship over the graves of the poets and of their two companions, Severn and Trelawney, buried beside them." The circular continued: "Aside from the main purpose of the present project — to preserve with proper honor two of the most sacred places of English literature — such a memorial is greatly needed by reason of the fact that in Rome — the goal of all cultivated travellers and readers — a complete edition of the poems and letters of Keats is not to be bought. The scheme will provide a place and facilities for a comprehensive study of both poets." Among the English supporters of the scheme we find the names of the Earl of Crewe (son of Keats's biographer, Lord Houghton), Lord Curzon of Kedleston, Sidney Colvin, George Wyndham, etc. The plan proved successful and since 1906 there has no longer been any danger of attempts such as had been made by the Roman municipality "to move the remains of Keats and Severn," attempts that had only been defeated by the interposition of Queen Victoria. —

Hilversum, Aug. 24.

J. VELDKAMP.

English Association in Holland. The Annual Committee Meeting was held at Utrecht on June 11. The Executive Committee for 1922-1923 was constituted as follows: Prof. Dr. J. H. Kern, Groningen, President; R. W. Zandvoort, Nijmegen, Hon. Secretary; Miss J. M. Kraft, Utrecht, Ass. Secretary; Miss F. J. Quanjer, The Hague, Hon. Treasurer.

To commemorate the centenary of Percy Bysshe Shelley, lectures will be given in ten different towns, under the auspices of the *English*

Association. During the second week of October, *Lascelles Abercrombie*, Lecturer on Poetry in the University of Liverpool, will lecture at Hilversum (10), Nijmegen (11), Haarlem (12), Arnhem (13) and The Hague (14). The following note, contributed by Mr. W. van Doorn, may be of interest:

Mr. Lascelles Abercrombie, Lecturer in Liverpool University, is well-known both as a writer of imaginative literature, and as a theorist on art in its various aspects. As a poet he has impressed the reading public less by his lyrics ('Interludes and Verses', 1908; 'Emblems of Love', 1912), all of them *de longue haleine*, than by his verse dramas, especially *The Sale of St. Thomas* (1911, reprinted in *Georgian Poetry I*), *Deborah*, (1912) and *The End of The World* (1914; recently reprinted in *Four Short Plays*). *The Sale of St. Thomas* especially has gained him a very great reputation. As one of his critics (Miss Sturgeon in *Studies of Contemporary Poets*) has put it: 'spiritual vision is here united with intellectuality as lucid as it is powerful: the mystic is also the humanitarian: imagination is balanced by a good grip on reality; the sense impressions are fine as well as exuberant'. — Mr. Abercrombie's *Essay Towards a Theory of Art* appeared this year and illustrates the same gifts.

In the third week of October, Prof. C. H. Herford, of the University of Manchester, will deliver lectures at Groningen (17), Amsterdam (18), Utrecht (19), Leiden (20) and Rotterdam (21). Prof. Herford's works, among which we mention *The Age of Wordsworth*, *Literary Relations of England and Germany in the XVIth century*, and the chapter on *Shelley* in the *Cambr. Hist. of Engl. Lit.*, are so well-known among Dutch students of English literature that we have no doubt many will welcome the opportunity of hearing him lecture.

Between November 21-25, St. John Ervine, author of several plays and novels, and dramatic critic of *The Observer*, will lecture on *The English Theatre: its Past, Present and Future*. The lectures will be given at Amsterdam (21), Haarlem (22), Utrecht (23), Arnhem (24), Rotterdam (25).

In the same week of November, Laurence Binyon, Keeper of the Oriental Prints and Drawings in the British Museum, will give a lantern lecture on *Chinese Painting*. He is well-known both as a poet and a writer on Oriental art. The series will be arranged as follows: Hilversum (21), Leiden (22), Nijmegen (23), Groningen (24), The Hague (25).

Lectures on *London in the days of Pepys* will be given by Mr. A. H. Blake in January. Particulars will be announced later on.

Applications for membership should be made to the local branch secretaries, whose addresses will be found on page 2 of the cover. Copies of the *Bulletin*, with full information on the aims and activities of the English Association, may be obtained from the Assistant Secretary, 41 Nieuwe Gracht, Utrecht.

English studies at Groningen. In announcing the publication, after thirty years' discussion and preparation, of the new 'Akademies Statuut' in last year's August number (p. 108), we expressed a fear 'that the Minister of Education, who seems to be fond of organization on paper, (would) think he (had) done enough for the universities by giving them the new rules.'

Time has unfortunately shown that our fear was only too well founded: the Minister has refused to grant money for the appointment of assistants for modern languages at Groningen University. The plan of the University was humble enough: the pitiful salary of f 2000 was thought sufficient for the men who were to be entrusted with the most important part of the training of the future scholar and teacher, unless, indeed, it was thought sufficient to have assistants in order to save the appearance of providing for the practical training of future modern language masters. Anyhow, the miserable pittance proposed was too much of a drain on the Dutch Treasury. The Minister has refused, however, to face the consequence that is clearly unavoidable to any one who is acquainted with the subject: he is not going to abolish modern language studies at Groningen. And the University professors of modern languages, unfortunately, have let slip an opportunity to show that they are indifferent to political machinations: they should have informed the Minister that they intended to reveal, by a public pronouncement, the truth that Groningen is no place to study foreign languages. This would have been both more practical in its political effect, and more fair towards the men who were inexperienced enough to put their trust in a Minister's 'plans' and on the strength of these resigned the positions they held in secondary schools. Instead of entering upon the path of honesty by a gate that is, indeed, narrow as we are taught to expect, both the Minister and the University, trusting in the ignorance and indifference of the public, are, seemingly, intending to pretend that it is possible to study modern languages at Groningen. A plan has been invented to help in keeping up this pretence, with an ingenuity worthy of a politician or a pettifogging lawyer, rather than of a genuine scholar. It is a specious scheme of semi-official assistants with a semi-official, but nominal, salary, to be eked out by contributions from the pockets of the unfortunate undergraduates who put faith in the University's claim of being able to offer a training in modern languages.

By this twopenny-halfpenny invention the inferior position of living languages at Groningen is even more strongly emphasized than at Amsterdam. The examinations in Groningen will necessarily be held by men who do not even profess to teach the subject they examine in. We do not mean to imply that the situation at Groningen is essentially worse than at Amsterdam. No, the arrangements are not really different, and as to the person selected for English, we have no objection to make. Mr. Kooistra, although we should have preferred to see the teaching of literature entrusted to him, would no doubt set up a reasonable practical standard, but he will not be able to do anything, for he will not examine.¹⁾ And his lectures, according to the announcement in the newspapers, are to be for undergraduates only. This must mean, as anybody will understand who is at all acquainted with the trend of University opinion on this subject, that the supporters of the scheme are of opinion that undergraduates should not be required to reach the standard expected from candidates for the A-examination. It is true that Professor Kern does not share this view, but the publication of the newspaper 'communiqué' referred to makes it more than doubtful if he will be able to carry through his will against his colleagues or the promoters of the scheme. A new grade of English examinations will thus be set up, superior to the L. O. standard, but below the M. O. examinations. We are sorry that good men, after being induced to give up their position in

¹⁾ See the German testimony in our note on the *Zs. f. franz. u. engl. Unterricht* in the Bibliography.

secondary schools, have practically been compelled to undertake this work, which really ranks with that of a dancingmaster rather than with the task of a University teacher.

With regard to the position of the living language we have frequently expressed, but in vain, our opinion that it is not given its due in the new arrangements, to the detriment both of scholarship and of the schools. We do not wish to add anything, but only quote a recent pronouncement by Prof. Delbrück, the veteran scholar of syntactic fame. In a little book on modern German syntax he declares ¹⁾ that historical and comparative grammar has too long been concerned almost exclusively with the oldest periods. And he continues: "In gegensatz dazu lernte man den wert der gegenwärtigen sprachen höher einschätzen. Das geschah, wie ich denke, hauptsächlich durch die glänzende entwicklung der romanischen philologie. Zuerst meinte man, dasz die romanischen sprachen eine mehr oder weniger kümmerliche entartung des Lateinischen darstellten. Dann sah man ein, dasz auch hier gesetz-mässige entwicklung vorliegt, und es wird allgemein zugestanden, dasz wir an den romanischen und anderen lebenden sprachen vieles für die alten sprachen gelernt haben, z. b. in der lautlehre". Of course Delbrück is thinking of the historical study of modern languages, but that he is fully convinced of the absolute necessity of a thorough study of the living stage is shown by what follows: 'Aehnlich wie mit dem Romanischen, aber auch nur ähnlich, verhält es sich mit dem Germanischen, denn es ist nicht zu leugnen, dasz in dem gelehrten betrieb das Gotische, Althochdeutsche und Mittelhochdeutsche vor dem Neuhochdeutschen ungebührlich bevorzugt worden sind. Diese und ähnliche erfahrungen haben uns dazu geführt, das wesen und die entwicklungs-gesetze der sprachen möglichst an den lebenden zu erforschen, und haben den verfasser dieser schrift, der selbst zu der sprachvergleichern gehört, veranlaszt, seine eigene muttersprache und in dieser die umgangssprache zur grundlage seiner darstellung zu wählen.'

The position of modern languages in our universities is at present such that the best we can hope is that very few people will undertake the study of these subjects there. The universities, as far as modern studies are concerned, will become institutions for granting degrees, not centres of teaching, still less research. And the few schoolmasters who will own their training as well as their degree to the university, will be in the unenviable situation of accepting £ 500 a year extra for their incompetence. It will be the task of the Modern Language Association to awake both the public and the authorities to the true facts of the situation. As for ourselves, we can only recommend those who are qualified to take a University degree to avoid modern languages, and, if they take them, to spend as much of their time as possible at foreign universities. Those who are compelled to take an M. O. diploma will only go to the University, if at all, for their study of historical English grammar.

K.

Morsbach's Successor. Prof. Dr. Hans Hecht, of the University of Basel, has been appointed Professor of English at Göttingen, and will succeed Prof. L. Morsbach as such at the beginning of Christmas Term.

We refer our readers to the "Festschrift" in honour of Prof. Morsbach, published by our namesake *Englische Studien* in March 1920 (cf. E. S. II, 96), and to our reviews of books by Prof. Hecht in vol. II, 60 and vol. III, 20.

¹⁾ *Grundlagen der neuhochdeutschen Satzlehre*, p. 84f.

Translation.

1. Starting his horse the Prince followed by the whole cavalcade rode over the bridge to the sound of a cheery blare of horns. 2. They swung out of the Bosch immediately and presently came to the meadowlands which were to be hunted. 3. It was a fine, mild morning, such as one sometimes meets with in February, even in this country: one of those winter days which bring us the balmy breath of spring in the breeze and which would almost make us believe that we shall soon see spring return, if we did not know that we still had March with its blustering storms and April with its showers to struggle through first. 4. And besides not one of the harbingers of the warm season was yet to be seen in the far-reaching meadow: no stork had returned yet to look up its old place: no peewits showed themselves yet, wheeling in graceful circles so that their wings, when they catch the rays of the sun, glitter like sparks of light: only here and there flocks of starlings darted away from the horses' feet or an old crow, perched on the top of a farm-gate seemed to await the arrival of the party and only then raised its heavy wings, as if with difficulty, to settle down again a little farther off.

5. Then, however propitious the state of the weather might be, that of the hunting-ground was less so, as the greater part of the ground was rather swampy with here and there large pools which one could ride round as long as one advanced at (a) walking-pace, but which it was to be foreseen could be avoided with difficulty once one was pursuing the game. 6. It may indeed seem strange to us living now(adays) that a day should be selected for hunting in such an unsuitable season, which moreover at the present day belongs to the close-time. 7. But, although in the seventeenth century, the sporting season and close-time were unknown, none the less hunting even at that date was forbidden when the ground was covered with snow or ice; while the hunting-regulations in Holland strictly forbade hunting more than twice a week throughout the year, as also taking more than two hares and one or two brace of rabbits on one day. 8. The natural consequence of this provision was that sportsmen never let an opportunity escape unless it were decidedly unfavourable.

9. The encountering of occasional obstacles such as the pools I have mentioned, and the ditches which intersected the meadow-land, had had the result that most of the sportsmen, including the ladies, did not ride on over the meadows, but kept to a byroad from which they could overlook the open country. 10. As for the Prince, who as a true sportsman shrank from no obstacles, he remained at the head of the others and pushed on, straight across country.

Observations. 1. *Putting his steed into motion.* — Hunter = jachtpaard. *To the merry tooting of the horn.* Under a joyous trumpet sound. Under referring to attendant circumstances is very rare; we could only find one instance in our notes: sitting down under the clapping of hands and stamping of boots (Pett Ridge, *Thanks to Sanderson*, p. 144). Acquitted amidst a tempest of applause. (*Harmsworth Magazine*, Dec. 1898, 420). — *Glad blare of horns.* H. Bradley in 'The Making of English' says: "Poets and rhetorical writers can still speak of 'a glad spirit', 'a glad landscape', but in ordinary talk we express the notion by other words, such as *joyous*, *cheerful*, *happy*, while *glad* is used only to characterize the state of feeling pleasure for some specified cause. — *Retinue (suite)* = Du. *gevolg*."

2. *They immediately wheeled out of the Bosch* is correct. The word *Bosch* is a place name (as shown by the capital letter) and should be kept in the English translation. *Came at the meadows*. The correct preposition after *come* is *to*. The verb *arrive* is followed by *at*. — *That were to be hunted (over); shot (over)*. During his stay the Belvoir coverts were *shot over*. (*Times Weekly Ed.*, 19 Jan. 1895). Colloquially the preposition is omitted: We shall soon be able to *shoot* the big coverts in the hollow. (*Daily News*, October 6. 1881).

3. *Sultry morning*. Do not mix up Du. *zwoel* (sultry; oppressively hot) with Du. *zoel*. — *Like one sometimes meets with in February*. *Like* is not a conjunction in literary English, but is often used in that function, especially in conversational English. — *Even here at land*. A literal translation of the Dutch is impossible. — *On which already a fragrant spring air streams to meet us*. Too literal. — *Nearly makes us believe*. — *We will soon see spring return*. Weak-stressed *will* is used in the first person to express an intention (See Kruisinga's *Accidence and Syntax*, § 441.) I will help you = Du. *Ik zal je eens helpen*. In our sentence the use of *will* would be wrong. — *Did we not know that*. An if-clause is sometimes expressed by inversion without a conjunction: Did you believe in God you would not say that. (Fergus Hume, *Lady Jim*, 265.). — *Breeze, gust, squall, storm*. A *breeze* is gentle and may be fitful, a *gust* is pretty strong, but especially sudden and brief, a *squall* is a *storm* that begins suddenly and is soon over, perhaps consisting of a series of strong *gusts*, a *storm* is a violent disturbance of the atmosphere, generally attended by rain, hail or snow.

4. *Add to this that not one of the heralds of spring revealed itself*. — *Extended meadow* should be *extensive m*. *Extended* would convey the idea of possessing extension, occupying space. We perceive it (viz. a body) as something different from our perception, and we perceive it as having something not in our perception; we perceive it, in short, as *extended*. (Mc. Cosh, *Berkeley*. 67.). In another sense: Mr. R. came towards me with *extended* arms. (*Pearson's Magazine*, Aug. 1904, 145.). *Extensive*: Beyond the lake lay an *extensive* chase (W. Scott, *Kenilworth*.). — *The acquainted spot*. This application of the word 'acquainted' is no longer current (Obsolete of persons, archaic of things. N. E. D.): Things *acquainted* and familiar to us. (Shakespeare, *2 Hen. IV.*, V. 2.). We are at home and upon *acquainted* ground. (Lamb, *Elia* II. IX. 294). Modern use: I am well *acquainted* with the road. (*Century Magazine*, 1892. 220.). — *Lapwing, Pe(e)wit*. The name *plover* is also popularly given to this bird, the eggs of which are sold as 'Plovers' eggs' (*Oxford Dictionary*.). As a matter of fact the *plover* belongs to a different species (Du. *plevier*, *pluvier*): The Dutch word *koppel* is rather ambiguous; it may either mean a couple or pair or a whole flock of birds. From the context it would appear that the word has the latter meaning. — *The coming of the pageant*. *Coming* is right, but *pageant* suggests a formal march, a brilliant or stately spectacle arranged for effect; especially a procession or parade with elaborate spectacular display; a showy parade. The Church *pageant* in 1909. Historical *pageants*. — *Making graceful circles, in which process their wings twinkled like sparks of light*. — *Darted from before the horses' feet*. — *Sitting on a farm-gate*. — *Stile* is quite wrong for 'rustic gate' (Du. *overstap*.). — *Cavalcade*. — *Only then did it raise*. The whole sentence is not negated. See Kruisinga, *Accidence & Syntax* § 2071. — *In order to settle again at a distance*. —

5. If we prefer *weather-conditions* to *state of the weather* the rest of the sentence requires alteration: *those of the hunting-ground were less so*. The

singular *weather-condition* is incorrect. (Poutsma, II, i. v.). — *Favourable-Propitious-Auspicious*. Favourable is the most comprehensive term. Like *propitious* it may be applied to both persons and things. Auspicious, on the other hand, is exclusively said of events or appearances. — *Pretty miry*. — *But, as might be expected, could, with difficulty, be avoided once the hunt was in full swing*. — *It was to foresee*. The passive form ought to have been used.

6. *It may well seem strange to us*. See Poutsma, I, p. 75. You may well look astonished (Kingsley, *Hypatia*, Ch. X.). The situation is one which might well draw a smile. (*Strand Magazine*, May 1916, 546). You may well ask "What is to know?" for the expression is an ambiguous one. (Mivart, *Nature and Thought*). In these examples *well* means *justifiably*. — *That a day was selected*. Not absolutely wrong, though as a rule *should* is used after clauses expressing a personal feeling or opinion. — *Close time* (with or without a hyphen) also *close season*. The sportsman, though possessed of every requisite qualification in the way of licence or permission to shoot, is not entitled to kill or take game at all times. Firstly, he may not do so either upon Sundays throughout the year, or upon Christmas Day, under a penalty of £ 5; and, secondly, the law has set apart certain periods of the year when game is not to be taken. These latter provisions are contained in the Game Act 1831. The close times vary to a certain extent in different countries and localities, but they will generally be found to include the breeding times of the species in question.

7. *People knew no time for opening and closing the hunting-season*. — *Yet . . . all the same, hunting was not allowed*. — *When snow or ice was lying on the land*. — *Throughout the year; The whole year round*. Both correct. *Throughout the whole year* is a blending of these two in which the word *whole* is redundant. — *Two times* is not English. See the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*. — *To catch more than two hares* sounds unsportsmanlike and had better be replaced by *take or kill*. — *Two braces of rabbits*. Words denoting a definite number, such as *gross*, *stone*, *brace* etc. take no plural *s*.

8. *Limitation* would not be taken to mean *restriction, provision, regulation*. It is in limitation that the master comes out. (One should not attempt what is beyond one's powers.) — *The natural result*. — *The amateurs let slip no opportunity unless it was downright unfavourable*. Right, except for the word *amateur*, which fails to render *liefhebber* in our text. An amateur is a person attached to a particular pursuit, study or science, as to music or painting; especially one who cultivates any study or art, from taste or attachment, without pursuing it professionally. (Webster.) Perhaps *enthusiast* would suit. — *Occasion* is wrong: On that *occasion* I had no opportunity of speaking to him.

9. *Did not cross the meadows, but took a short cut*. Du. *binnenweg* has two meanings: 1) little frequented road, or by-road; 2) crossing that shortens the distance, short-cut. It is not clear from the context what is meant.

10. *Keen sportsman*. — *Was dismayed by no obstacles. Concerning the Prince* = *Betreffende den Prins*.

Good translations were received from Miss B. M. C., Tilburg; Miss W. D., Enschedé; Miss M. G., Amsterdam; Miss A. H., Flushing; Miss T. v. M., 's Hertogenbosch; Mr. J. P. P., Rotterdam; Miss A. E. S., Gorleston-on-sea; Mr. B. S., Koog a/d Zaan; Mr. B. de W., Moordrecht.

„Ik zeg je, Peter,” zei Mevrouw Emming tot haar man, een geacht geneesheer en burger van Berlijn, „dat Mevrouw Van Pelten niets mankeert; ze is alleen ziek van verlangen naar haar man en haar kind.”

„Weet je het weer beter dan ik?” vroeg hij plagend, terwijl hij haar in de wang kneep en zich bukte om haar te kussen. Ze was veel kleiner en aanmerkelijk jonger dan hij: niemand zou dan ook gedacht hebben, dat dit kinderlijke vrouwtje, behalve ander kroost, al een tienjarigen zoon had. „En hoe is Mevrouw tot deze diagnose gekomen?”

„Wel, als ze bij ons komt, kijkt ze niet om naar de jongens, maar Marietje verwent en vertroetelt ze, zelfs meer dan mij lief is. Ze heeft me al een keer of vijf gevraagd, hoe oud ze is; tien tegen één, dat haar eigen dochtertje van denzelfden leeftijd is, en blonde krullen en blauwe oogen heeft, net als ons kind. Trouwens, Mevrouw is zelf ook blond: het zou dus best kunnen.”

Dit gesprek tusschen den dokter en zijn vrouw had plaats in de gang van hun echtelijke woning, een ruim bovenhuis van één verdieping in één der Berlijnsche voorsteden, terwijl Mevrouw Emming haar man in zijn overjas hielp en daarna uitliet, een kleine vriendelijkheid, die ze hem elken dag, als hij zijn patienten ging bezoeken, bewees. Het was een morgen in 't begin van Mei, mooi, maar tamelijk frisch, en aangezien de dokter graag in een open voertuig reed, had ze hem met moederlijke bezorgdheid overgehaald niet zonder overjas uit te gaan.

„En wat zou je dan aanraden te doen?” hervatte Dr. Emming. „Ik zou berglucht voorschrijven, haar naar Zwitserland sturen, naar dat plaatsje waar haar man woont, je weet wel, waar ze dien tunnel aan 't bouwen zijn, en — de rest komt vanzelf”, antwoordde ze op vertrouwelijke toon.

„Haar naar Kandersteg zenden?” zei de dokter peinzend, „hm, ik zal er eens over denken.” Hij deelde niet het vaste geloof van zijn vrouw, dat deze twee trotsche menschen weer tot elkaar te brengen zouden zijn. Eigenlijk was hij een beetje huiverig in zoo'n intieme aangelegenheid als een soort van bemiddelaar op te treden.

De dokter liep vlug de trap af, maar vóór hij in zijn auto stapte, keek hij naar boven en wuifde met de hand tegen zijn beide jongste kinderen, die hun neusjes plat drukten tegen het raam om Paatje te zien wegrijden. Terwijl de auto de straten doorvlog, haalde Dr. Emming een notitieboekje te voorschijn met de lijst van zijn patienten en keek het eenige minuten in. Bij den naam van Pelten kwamen hem onwillekeurig de woorden van zijn vrouw in de gedachten. Haar idee was misschien nog zoo kwaad niet. Er bestond altijd eenige kans, dat er een verzoening tot stand gebracht zou kunnen worden tusschen den heer Van Pelten en zijn vrouw. Ze hadden wel een hevigen twist gehad, maar het was geweest over een betrekkelijk onbeduidende zaak. Toch had dit tot een volslagen vervreemding geleid. Geen van beiden kon echter iets ergers dan overmatige trots en koppigheid verweten worden. Misschien zou het gemis van elkanders bijzijn hen langzamerhand wel zachter gestemd hebben. Bij nader overleg besloot de dokter dus op den raad zijner vrouw in te gaan.

Reviews.

Language, its nature, development and origin. By OTTO JESPERSEN.
London, George Allen & Unwin Ltd. 1922. 448 p. 18 sh. net.

All the numerous details of this new book by Jespersen marshal around the great problem of the general principle of the evolution of language, which the author, in his last chapter (p. 429) defines as follows: “The evolution of language shows a progressive tendency from inseparable irregular conglomerations to freely and regularly combinable short elements”. In the very earliest period, when language was originating, these “conglomerations” consisted in the songs by which primitive man gave utterance to his emotions, in special to that of love, and only very gradually did the primitive communities begin to see in these long groups of syllables the names of the phenomena and facts to which those emotions referred. And then commenced the evolution that lasted for several millennia, towards ever simpler forms, the evolution via the more complicated systems of language, which we know among the Indians e.g. and the already less synthetic systems of e.g. Sanskrit and Latin, to the strongly analytical systems, such as those of French, Danish and especially English.

These ideas are not new to those who know Jespersen's "Progress in Language", but all the same this is an entirely new book, owing to the abundance of new material and the clear arrangement of it. The author once more proves himself a master who stands above the problems, who does not allow himself to be caught by the doctrine of any particular school, and who applies the necessary criticism to his own ideas as well. He praises Madvig and Whitney for "the sobriety of their reasoning and their superior clearness of thought"; these are also his own qualities, but he escapes the error that he notes in them of reconstructing primitive men to their own image "as serious and well-meaning men endowed with a large share of common-sense" (p. 433).

Jespersen's ideas on the evolution of language have already had a great influence, and nowadays most scholars will probably agree with him that languages show a general tendency towards an evolution from a complicated synthetic system to a simpler analytic system. Jespersen considers this evolution as progress: "that language ranks highest which goes farthest in the art of accomplishing much with little means, or, in other words, which is able to express the greatest amount of meaning with the simplest mechanism" (p. 324). This is of course no longer the statement of a demonstrable or refutable fact, it is a personal valuation, and just as much as a man is at liberty not to think that society an ideal one that combines a maximum output with a minimum of labour, where material life goes without a hitch, so to say, so it is not necessary for us to rejoice with Jespersen at the fact that languages in general are more and more able "to express the greatest amount of meaning with the simplest mechanism". The oldest language was more poetical than the more modern languages, says Jespersen; are we to rejoice at such a development? Do we not notice repeatedly, in various fields of human activity, that all progress in a certain direction is apt to be attended by the loss of much that is sympathetic in another field? During the time that I often used to speak with Russian men and women from the people, I was fascinated again and again by their fine way of telling things; in general our own people are far behind them in this respect. And folksongs like the Russian we do not possess by far. And Puškin, as a poet, is unsurpassed in European literature. Am I, none the less, to consider Dutch, Danish or English superior as compared with Russian because the latter employs a great number of flexional forms and more long word formations? It may be true that for handling a more synthetic language more complicated psychic processes are required, but a man who speaks such a language as his mother tongue does not suffer the slightest discomfort therefrom, and one does not detect any more rapid mental wear in him than among us and our likes. I for one prefer to be content with noting evolution in language without speaking of progress or retrogression.

The main line along which the evolution of language progresses is intimately linked up with the evolution of communities. And the separate moments in the history of separate languages will also probably have to be considered in connection with social phenomena. But as soon as we come to details, we are faced with great difficulties. Great popularity was and is still enjoyed by the "substratum theory", which accounts for linguistic change from the adoption of a language by a population that formerly spoke another language. Anyone feels that this doctrine contains a kernel of truth, but none the less it can only account for a very small portion of the facts of linguistic change. The critical consideration of the "substratum theory," and the reduction of its scope to more modest proportions are a very successful part of Jespersen's

book. At the same time he, too, has not found the formula that explains, once and for all, the enigma of the phenomena of linguistic change. Besides the not entirely deniable influence of the ethnical substratum he believes especially in two social factors: "In the first place, the influence of parents, and grown-up people generally, may be less than usual, because an unusual number of parents may be away from home, as in great wars of long duration, or may have been killed off, as in the great plagues Secondly, there may be periods in which the ordinary restraints on linguistic change make themselves less felt than usual, because the whole community is animated by a strong feeling of independence and wants to break loose from social ties of many kinds, including those of a powerful school organization or literary tradition" (p. 260). It is not to be denied that similar social conditions may and must further rapid linguistic change, but they can no more be considered as the general or even as the principal cause of linguistic change than the influence of the ethnical substratum. I should like to point out two things for which an adequate explanation still remains to be given:

1. Although the "junggrammatische" view of sound law and analogy puts too simple a construction on the facts, the history of language not only reveals to us sound laws, but even groups of sound laws which operate in a common tendency. Thus Primitive Slavonic has eliminated all falling diphthongs and all final consonants, in consequence of a tendency towards "free contact" and a rising wave of sonority. How do such tendencies originate? Our insight into the interaction between the individual and the crowd must become considerably clearer and more concrete before such a question can be answered.

2. When from a language a number of younger languages have developed that exist fairly independently from each other, sometimes even entirely apart, we are often struck by a strong parallelism in development, as if their history were pre-determined in its main features. Meillet has drawn attention to this more than once. How is this? No one has answered this question yet, nor has Jespersen done so by pointing to the isolated life of groups of children and to the sense of independence of entire communities of men as the causes of intensive linguistic change.

Thus Jespersen's new book is not, any more than his former writings, the last word on the great problems that occupy him and every philologist. But it does belong to the best of what has been written on them. Our knowledge will not have got beyond the period of question marks for some time to come, each new theory is capable of being contested, supplemented and improved. But this labour of correction must be done with an unprejudiced mind and Jespersen is eminently unprejudiced. Some have seen in "sound symbolism" a main factor in the origin and history of language, others have stoutly denied this theory; a sober critical examination of the question is to be found in Jespersen. In how far does the development of children's speech give us an image of that of the speech of mankind? A clearer discussion of the question than Jespersen gives us cannot be desired; of far-reaching theories only that is kept which can stand sound criticism. And thus it is with every new problem that Jespersen brings within the scope of his investigation.

In this way his book has great value for everyone who is interested in the fundamental problems of philology, and it will keep its value as long as the reading public prefers an unprejudiced judgment to doctrinaire theories.

Leiden.

N. VAN WIJK.

The English School of Lutenist Song-writers. Transcribed, Scored and Edited from the Original Editions, by E. H. FELLOWES, M.A., Mus. Doc. John Dowland, First Book of Aires (1597). Part I. Nos. 1—10. Winthrop Rogers (18 Berners Street W. 1) 1920. — 5/—.

I have in my possession a dainty, green volume, (cheap at the pre-war price of one shilling), entitled *Lyrics from the Song-Books of the Elizabethan Age*, and edited by that distinguished literary veteran, the late Mr. A. H. Bullen. This handy volume has beguiled many an idle hour, and has often set me wondering about the tunes to which these lyrical gems were sung. Names like Byrd, Kirbye, Campion, John Dowland, conveyed nothing to me, although I understood quite well that their work was something very unlike Schubert's. And again I had occasion to be vexed at my defective equipment as a teacher of English and English literature.

An average Hollander will, on hearing about English songs, think of two types, and two types only. The one is the modern music hall song, the other is the sentimental wail, beloved of Mid-Victorian drawing-rooms, and not nearly impopular yet, when things are looked into. Ah, what pleasant tears have been drawn from perfectly willing eyes by such beautiful songs as 'Nita, Juanita', and 'The Cottage by the Sea', and 'Won't you Buy my Pretty Flowers'!

To such a believer in the negligibleness and the insipidity of English song — of course he does not know 'Come, Lasses and Lads', or 'Since First I Saw your Face', or 'A-hunting We Will Go', or 'Gather your Rosebuds while ye May' — the scholarly work of Dr. E. H. Fellowes should come as a revelation.

John Dowland was a lutenist, a performer on the lute. The 'General Preface' tells us many interesting things about the school of which he was the chief adornment. Its career was shortlived but brilliant, beginning with Dowland's first volume in 1597 and practically ending with the same composer's *A Pilgrim's Solace* published in 1612. 'During this period some thirty volumes, or sets, were issued, of which copies have survived to our own time.... The words were set by these Lutenist composers with a true appreciation of their poetic value; their sole purpose was to enhance the beauty of the recitation of such lines through the medium of simple musical expression as opposed to any idea of elaborate device.'

Dr. Fellowes gives two versions of each song. There is a literal version, which when played upon a harpsichord should produce an effect closely approaching that of the lute. But there is also an alternative version intended for the modern piano, in which 'the original barring of the voice-part has been somewhat modified with the object of simplifying the interpretation of the music. The principle of irregularity in this matter has been retained, and.... the crotchet (or minim) unit remains constant in value right through each song, whatever may be the variations of rhythm.'

John Dowland was of Irish extraction, his name being originally Doolan. According to his editor, he was not only one of the greatest song-writers that England has ever produced, but he is to be placed unhesitatingly among the world's greatest song-writers of all time. Personally I hesitate to place him as high as that supreme master of song, the gentle and genial Austrian Franz Schubert, who combines the most exquisite melodies with simply marvellous pictorial qualities. I am even inclined to rate him a little lower than Lawes or Purcell. But he deserves to be known and appreciated as he was in Elizabethan times, when he celebrated triumphs all over the Continent. And the book is to be warmly recommended to such members of the English

Association in Holland as are willing to oblige social gatherings with a song, and are anxious to lay hands on a musical volume whose quaint contents are sure to appeal.

WILLEM VAN DOORN.

The vicissitudes of the Chapbook will be dealt with in our next number.

Two Americans on Dryden.

The Poetry of John Dryden: By MARK VAN DOREN. — Harcourt, Brace and Howe. 1920. —

John Dryden and a British Academy: By Professor OLIVER F. EMERSON (Western Reserve University, U.S.A.). — From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. X. Milford. 1921. — 1/6.

Two very dissimilar things; one, a book, well and warmly written, a rehabilitation of Dryden, the poet; the other, a sober treatise, setting forth Dryden's merits as a student of his mother-tongue. Both are welcome.

The romantic conception of poetry, prevalent, nay rampant, from the time of Rousseau down to our days, and not nearly extinct yet, has always been hostile to literary work like Dryden's, giant though he indisputably is. But the realm of poetry is not a church, or, if it really must be circumscribed by certain tenets, we should be careful to reject any that would leave Dryden outside. True, he cannot poetize over a primrose by a river's brim, but he can draw characters. True, he has not any stool 'to be melancholy upon', but he has much intermittently flowing humour. True, he is unequal, like Wordsworth, but where he falls below his level, he — unlike Wordsworth — does not make the impression of mistaking his own dulness for inspired wisdom. And granted that his colouring is not subdued and that he does not scumble his outlines, — does that prevent him from being an artist?

'Latterly the critics with historical bent and eclectic taste have been busy either at placing Dryden in time or at explaining his imperfections by an appeal to the shortcomings of the audience for which he wrote. This tasting and this research have done much to lay bare huge flaws and inequalities in the surface which Dryden presented to posterity. Little has been done in the way of exploring the large spirit which worked beneath that surface, or in surveying other surfaces less conspicuous . . . The story of Dryden's poetry is the story of a sinewy mind attacking bulky materials.' Not unfrequently the sinewy mind loses vigour, so that the bulky material gets diluted, as we find it diluted in a poet who must have been dear to Mr. Mark van Doren's Dutch forbears, long-winded Jacob Cats:

'As when a sudden storm of hail and rain
Beats to the ground the yet unbearded grain,
Think not the hopes of harvest are destroyed
On the flat field, and on the naked void;
The light unloaded stem, from tempest freed,
Will raise the youthful honours of his head;
And, soon restored by native vigour, bear
The timely product of the bounteous year.'

(*Britannia Rediviva*.)

More often, however, the poet warms with his subject, e.g. where he gives free renderings of eloquent passages in Lucretius, his favourite Latin author. Then there is a passionate, jerky movement in his verse, which rouses and stirs . . .

'We, who are dead and gone, shall bear no part
 In all the pleasures, nor shall feel the smart
 Which to that other mortal shall accrue
 Whom of our matter time shall mold anew.
 For backward if you look on that long space
 Of ages past, and view the changing face
 Of matter, tossed and variously combined
 In sundry shapes, 't is easy for the mind
 From thence 't infer, that seeds of things have been
 In the same order as they now are seen;
 Which yet our dark remembrance cannot trace,
 Because a pause of life, a gaping space,
 Has come betwixt, where memory lies dead,
 And all the wandering motions from the sense are fled.¹⁾

And if Dryden's songs 'never go deeper than the painted fires of conventional Petrarchan love' (Mr. van Doren's metaphor seems rather curious), he is the master of the prologue and epilogue in English. The ninety-five pieces which he is known to have composed for delivery from the front of the Restoration stage, "give, more adequately than any other division of his work, a notion of his various powers: his speed, his precision, his weight, his melody, his tact. He seems to have been braced in writing them by his consciousness that they would be heard by acute and critical ears in actual playhouses; for he has purged himself of conceits, bombast, and mannered elegance. They are his most speaking poems; they have the warmth of flesh and blood. He has written some of them as much for fun as for money.... They are a running commentary on forty years of his life, as well as a living mirror in which the tiny theatrical world of Charles and James is shrewdly reflected".

The Poetry of John Dryden is a fine book. This is not to say that it is in every way perfect. Sometimes the author seems to lack the sense of historical perspective, e.g. where he says that 'the wars Waller sung were petty affairs' (p. 28). Were they really? The Dutch wars certainly were not, and no naval encounter in the late war can be compared for grandeur with Tromp's and de Ruyter's sea-fights, or with van Wassenaer Obdam's disaster off Lowestoft in 1665.

The author's American ear often hears lines of verse differently from a European's. In

'But baffled by an arbitrary crowd',

where, according to Mr. van Doren, there is no pause whatever, a slight pause will certainly occur after the word 'baffled'. And Guyomar's speech (from 'The Indian Emperor'), quoted on page 111, contains at least three

¹⁾ Rer. Nat. III 847—860.

Nec, si materiem nostram collegerit aetas
 post obitum rursumque redegerit ut sita nunc est,
 atque iterum nobis fuerint data lumina vitae,
 pertineat quicquam tamen ad nos id quoque factum,
 interrupta semel cum sit retinentia nostri.
 Et nunc nil ad nos de nobis attinet, ante
 qui fuimus, neque iam de illis nos adficit angor.
 Nam cum respicias immensi temporis omne
 praeteritum spatium, tum motus material
 multimodis quam sint, facile hoc adcredere possis,
 semina saepe in eodem, ut nunc sunt, ordine posta.
 Nec memori tamen id quimus repraehendere mente
 inter enim: iectast vitae pausa, vageque
 deerrarunt passim motus ab sensibus omnes.

'departures from the iambic norm,' though we are assured there are none.¹⁾

Are the possibilities of rime so very great in English? (page 110). In this respect it is far inferior to Italian and French, for the simple reason that English has a wider vowel-range than either of the two, and more consonants. *Quiet* only rimes with *riot*, though Mr. Herbert Trench has found an additional *fiat*, and Aleister Crowley has hit upon *eyot*. Is there a pure rime to *anger*? Professor Housman's *holt* and *hanger* is ingenious, but allows no repetition. Many English poets cannot do without *love-move* or *gush-bush* or *the wind-mankind*.

Literary references ought to have been more detailed. It will not do to refer merely to 'Theocritus', when a quotation is given from his third idyll, lines 18 and 19.

* * *

The British Academy was founded in 1901 and was granted a royal charter in 1902. It embraces four divisions: (1) History and Archæology; (2) Philology; (3) Philosophy; (4) Jurisprudence and Economics. So it corresponds to the famous French *Académie* as it developed afterwards. But the avowed aim of the real founders of the latter institution, including Richelieu, had been the improvement of the French language, and the composition of dictionaries and grammars. And not only Dryden, but also John Evelyn and other notable contemporaries were strongly in favour of an English Academy modelled on the lines of the French prototype. The matter was even taken up by the Royal Society. But the project, such as it was, fell through, and Professor Emerson finds various causes for its failure. He also points out how reluctant Dryden was to abandon this pet notion of his. In his *Dedication of Troilus and Cressida* to the Earl of Sunderland he strongly urges the necessity of an Academy.

"The perfect knowledge of a tongue was never attained by any single person. The court, the college, and the town (not the country-side, W.v.D.) must be joined in it. And as our English is a composition of the dead and the living tongues, there is required a perfect knowledge not only of Greek and Latin, but of the old German, the French, and the Italian; and to help all these, a conversation with those authors of our own who have written with the fewest faults in prose and verse . . . I am desirous, if it were possible, that we might all write with the same certainty of words and purity of phrase to which the Italians first arrived, and after them the French . . ."

Dryden's eloquent appeal was of no avail. Perhaps it was as well. Dryden's failure contributed to the success of Dr. Samuel Johnson, the dictator.

W. v. D.

Brief Mention.

Longfellow's Excelsior, edited by FRED. QUANJER. Landmark Series for the study of English idiom. Rijswijk, Blankwaardt en Schoonhoven, 1922.

This little book is intended for students and general readers who want to increase their knowledge of idiom by the direct method. To this end a well-known poem has been chosen, which is treated word by word, synonyms and allied expressions being given in abundance. The notes are preceded by a paraphrase of the poem. Space does not allow of any criticism of detail; the booklet is well worth acquiring for those who have already attained some proficiency in English, and who want a change from the ordinary handbooks.

Z.

¹⁾ 1. To that sea-shore where no more world is found.

2. Where, for a while, my eyes no object met.

3. Upon the sea, somewhat methought did rise.

Bibliography.¹⁾

POETRY, FICTION, DRAMA.

Anglo-Saxon and Norse Poems. Edited and translated by N. KERSHAW. $9 \times 5\frac{3}{4}$, xiv. + 207 pp. Cambridge University Press. 14s. n.

This contains text and translation (on opposite pages) of six Anglo-Saxon poems and seven Norse poems.

The Old English Physiologus. Text and prose translations by ALBERT STANBURROUGH COOK, Professor of the English Language and Literature in Yale University. Verse translation by JAMES HALL PITMAN. (Yale Studies in English.) $9 \times 5\frac{3}{4}$, v. + 25 pp. New Haven: Yale University Press. London: Milford. 80 cents.

Cleanness, an Alliterative Tripartite Poem on the Deluge, the Destruction of Sodom, and the Death of Belshazzar, by the Poet of Pearl. Edited by SIR ISRAEL GOLLANCZ. Milford. 5s. net.

English and Scottish Popular Ballads. Edited from the collection of FRANCIS JAMES CHILD, by HELEN CHILD SARGENT and GEORGE LYMAN KITTREDGE. $8\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$, xxxi. + 729 pp. Harrap. 1922. 15s. n.

Poems from the Works of Charles Cotton. Newly Decorated. By CLAUD LOVAT FRASER. Poetry Bookshop. 1922. 5/- net.

William Blake's Designs for Gray's Poems. Introduction by H. J. C. GRIERSON. Milford. £ 15 15s. net.

The Shepherd, and Other Poems of Peace and War. By EDMUND BLUNDEN. 9×6 , 86 pp. Richard Cobden Sanderson. 1922. 6s. n.

Late Lyrics and Earlier, with Many Other Verses. By THOMAS HARDY. Macmillan. 1922. 7s. 6d. n.

Poems by ISAAC ROSENBERG. Selected and edited by GORDON BOTTOMLEY. With an introductory memoir by LAURENCE BINYON. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, xii. + 186 pp. Heinemann. 1922. 6s. n.

Real Property. By HAROLD MONRO. 8×6 , 63 pp. Poetry Bookshop. 1922. 3s. 6d. n. [A review will appear.]

Selected Poems. By JOHN DRINKWATER. $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$, 94 pp. Sidgwick and Jackson, 1922. 3s. 6d. n.

Containing selections from "Poems, 1908-1914," "Swords and Ploughshares" (1915), "Olton Pools" (1916), "Tides" (1917), "Loyalties" (1919), and "Seeds of Time" (1921).

The Forsyte Saga. By JOHN GALSWORTHY. In one volume, with a special introduction. Heinemann, 1922. 7/6-10/6. Book I. *The Man of Property*. Interlude - *Indian Summer of a Forsyte*. Book II. *In Chancery*. Interlude - *Awakening*. Book III. *To Let*.

Mortal Coils. By ALDOUS HUXLEY. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5$, 229 pp. Chatto and Windus. 1922. 6s. n.

The Things We Are. By JOHN MIDDLETON MURRY. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5$, 320 pp. Constable. 7s. 6d. n.

Mr. Prohack. By ARNOLD BENNETT. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, 313 pp. Methuen. 1922. 7s. 6d. n.

The Return. By WALTER DE LA MARE. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, 309 pp. Collins. 1922. 7s. 6d. n.

The Secret Places of the Heart. By H. G. WELLS. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5$, 311 pp. Cassell. 1922. 7s. 6d. n.

The Two Flames. By MABEL MAAS. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, 256 pp. Jonathan Cape. 1922. 7s. 6d. n.

Lanty Hanlon. A Comedy of Irish Life. By PATRICK MACGILL. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, 312 pp. Herbert Jenkins. 1922. 7s. 6d. n.

Little Plays of St. Francis. By LAURENCE HOUSMAN. Sidgwick and Jackson, 1922.

A Family Man. In three acts. By JOHN GALSWORTHY. 7×5 , 116 pp. Duckworth. 3s. n.

HISTORY OF LITERATURE, CRITICISM.

The Possible Begetter of the Old English "Beowulf" and "Widsith." By ARTHUR STANBURROUGH COOK. $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$, pp. 285-346. New Haven: Yale University Press. 1922.

An essay upon the hypothesis that "Beowulf" (and incidentally "Widsith") was composed at the Court of the Northumbrian King Aldfrith, who reigned from 695 to 705.

Sir Thomas Malory. By E. K. CHAMBERS, C.B. $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6$, 16 pp. The English Association Pamphlet, No. 51. A. V. Houghton (4, Buckingham-gate, S.W. 1). 2s. n.

The Shakespeare Canon. By J. M. ROBERTSON. Routledge. 1922. 12s. 6d. net.

Shakespeare's "Hamlet." By A. CLUTTON-BROCK. $7 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$, vii. + 125 pp. Methuen. 1922. 5s. n.

The Narrative of the El-ho "Sjouke Gabbes". A Dutch source for Robinson Crusoe. Edited by L. L. HUBBARD. Wahr, Ann Arbor, U.S.A., 1921. [A review will appear.]

¹⁾ This instalment includes books published up to June. The list will be brought up to date in the next number. Ed.

PERIODICALS.

De Gids. July 1922. A. Roland Holst, Shelley: een afscheid. **Id.** Sept. 1922. Dr. André Jolles, Shelley's Pad naar de Dichtkunst.

De Nieuwe Gids. July 1922. Mr. D. Spanjaard, Shelley, de Dichter der Universeele Liefde. (Continued Aug., Sept. and Oct.) Dr. K. H. de Raaf, Shelley en de Slang. **Id.** Sept. 1922. W. Kloos, Percy Bysshe Shelley in Nederland.

Levensche Bijdragen. XIII, 3, 4. Includes A. J. Carnoy, The Semasiology of American and other Slangs (continued).

Modern Language Review. XVII, 3, July 1922. Includes: D. Everett, The W. E. Prose Psalter of Richard Rolle of Hampole. — A. C. Baugh, Some new facts about Shirley. — A. C. Dunstan, The German influence on Coleridge.

Modern Language Notes. XXXVII, 6, June 1922. Includes: E. C. Knowlton, Causality in *Samson Agonistes*. — G. C. Vogt, *The Wife of Bath's Tale*, *Women Pleased* and *La Fée Uryele*: a study in the transformation of folk-lore themes in drama. — A. M. Bierstadt, Unacknowledged poems by Th. Campbell. — W. F. Tamblin, Notes on *King Lear*. — W. A. Eddy, A source for Gulliver's First Voyage.

Philological Quarterly. I, 2, April 1922. Includes: H. Craig, Problems in Renaissance Scholarship. — A. H. R. Fairchild, "Mummy" in Shakespeare.

Revue germanique. XIII, 3, Juillet—Nov. 1922. Includes: E. Pons, Odoacre dans la poésie anglo-saxonne. — H. Ruyssen, Le théâtre anglais (Revue annuelle).

Revue de littérature comparée. II, 3, Juillet—Sept. 1922. R. Galland, Un poète errant de la Renaissance: Jean van der Noot et l'Angleterre. — J. Dresch, Borne et son histoire inédite de la Révolution française. — H. Girard, Comment Shelley a été révélé à Victor Hugo: la *Grève de Samarez* de Pierre Leroux. — J. Hankiss, Petöfi et les poètes français. — F. Chambon, Mérimée et la société anglaise.

Neuere Sprachen. XXX, 3—4 (March—May 1922.) Includes: E. Mackel, Die sprache im dienste der auslandskunde. — K. Ehrke, Die kulturkundliche einstellung im englischen unterricht. — C. Riemann, Lehrplanskizze für einen neunjährigen englischen unterrichtsgang. Notes. Reviews. **Id.** XXX, 5, 6 (June—July 1922). Includes: Dibelius, Die Englischen Universitäten. Notes and News. Reviews.

Ger.-Rom. Monatsschrift. X, 5—6 (May—June 1922). Includes: Hecht, Shakespeare's Testament und die vorrede der schauspieler zur ersten folio. Notes and News. Reviews.

Beiblatt zur Anglia. 33, IV—VII (April—July 1922). Reviews, including Ekwall, on Förster, Keltisches wortgut in Englischen. — Fischer, on Weston, From Ritual to Romance. — Fehr on Chambers, Beowulf. — Funke, on Ehrentreich, Zur quantität der tonvokale im Modern-Englischen. Notes: Meyer, *Wealpeow*. — Horn, Understood. — Holthausen, Zum Physiologus. Zu Chaucers *Reeves Tale*. — Ekwall, O. L. Gyrwe. — Eichler, Schauspielerinnen in London um 1600? — Lindkvist, Notes on Aelfric's Festermen.

Zeitschrift für franz. und engl. unterricht. 21, 2 (1922). Includes Freund, Die Universitätslektorate für neuere fremdsprachen (On the unsatisfactory results of the system of assistants for modern languages that is now being imitated in Dutch universities. We quote one passage: "Es steht ausser zweifel, dass unsere deutschen neuphilologen beim verlassen der universität an wissenschaftlicher tüchtigkeit¹⁾ ihren fachgenossen in England und Frankreich überlegen sind. Aber ebensovienig kann es zweifelhaft sein, dass sie ihnen an neusprachlichen können, an kenntnis der modernen literatur und an technischer bereitschaft für ihren lehrerberuf nachstehen. Wie ist das bei dem bestehen der lektorate möglich? Es ligt an der machtlosen und einflussarmen stellung des lektors in lehrbetrieb der universität und an seiner nichtbeteiligung an den prüfungen in der grossen mehrzahl von fällen. In England und Frankreich werden die studierenden in der gesprochenen sprache und der neueren literatur van Universitätslehrern geprüft, die selbst diese gegenstände regelmässig lehren".) — Hoch, Zum Englischen als erster fremdsprache. — Sanftleben, Der übergang van Extemporalien zu fremdsprachlichen aufätzen. — Reviews.

ERRATUM.

On page 189 of this number read: Translation M. O. 1922, instead of 1921.

¹⁾ i. e. Knowledge of the older periods of the language and of the older literature

The Women of George Eliot's Novels.

(Continued)

The number of egoistic female characters in G. Eliot's works is smaller than that of her altruistic women. There are but a few to be added. The Countess Czerlaski in *The Sad Fortunes of the Reverend Amos Barton* knows, like Rosamund Vincy, how to appear amiable and charming, and yet to gratify all her selfish desires. The egoism of Tessa in *Romola* is a childish one, an egoism which is less contemptible because it is based on ignorance and simplicity. Mrs. Pullet in *The Mill on the Floss* represents a selfishness which centres in an exaggerated care for health, while the chief motive of Mrs. Transome's egoism in *Felix Holt* is ambition. In showing us how many men had become more or less cruelly affected by the ignorance or selfish action of some fellow-being, G. Eliot wanted to stimulate us "to an energetic effort that the lives nearest to us should not suffer in a like manner from us." ¹⁾

A similar intention guided her in the delineation of mixed characters. "My artistic bent", she writes, "is directed to the presentation of mixed human beings in such a way as to call forth tolerant judgment, pity and sympathy." ²⁾ What G. Eliot meant by mixed characters she tells us in *Felix Holt*, where she defines them as "susceptible natures in which battle is inevitable, and the side of victory uncertain." (vol. II, p. 153). She had a special preference for them, most probably because being herself susceptible, she could in their delineation keep very close to what she knew most familiarly. In Dorothea Brooke, in *Romola* and above all in Maggie Tulliver the personal accent is very easily to be recognised. G. Eliot's mixed characters are her most interesting creations. They are generally complicated, but in most cases their development is carried out with great logical consequence, so that they do not present extraordinary difficulties to sympathetic and attentive readers.

Gwendolen Harleth in *Daniel Deronda* belongs to them. "Was she beautiful or not beautiful, and what was the secret of form or of expression which gave the dynamic qualities to her glance? Was the good or the evil genius dominant in those beams? Probably the evil, else why was the effect that of unrest rather than of undisturbed charm? Why was the wish to look again felt as a coercion, and not as a longing in which the whole being consents?" ³⁾ In these words with which G. Eliot begins the description of Gwendolen, she already indicates that opposite powers and inclinations are struggling with each other in her soul. Then she shows how at first the lower tendencies are dominating, but how gradually by the purifying effect of great sorrow and the ennobling influence of Daniel Deronda the higher faculties are roused and conquer those by which they had been enslaved before.

"Mr. Lewes has not heard any complaints of not understanding Gwendolen", G. Eliot wrote shortly after the publication of *Daniel Deronda* "but a strong partisanship for and against her." ⁴⁾ The latter was natural enough with a character like Gwendolen's, in which selfishness and goodness had to be

¹⁾ J. W. Cross, *Life of G. E.*, vol. II, p. 191.

²⁾ *Ibidem*, vol. I, p. 349.

³⁾ *Daniel Deronda*, vol. I, p. 5.

⁴⁾ J. W. Cross, *G. Eliot's Life*, vol. II, p. 414.

combined in such a way as to secure our sympathy on the one hand and to give full scope to the play of passions and impulses on the other. But G. Eliot knew well how to overcome the difficulties connected with this combination, so that Gwendolen's character strikes us with its reality and proves its author's mastery in psychological analysis.

Some circumstances of Gwendolen's life remind of Esther Lyon in *Felix Holt*. Esther is like Gwendolen a petted, spoiled child that has become a selfish young lady, who cares too much for her own small tastes and too little for what affects others. Her self-questioning, her longing to live another life that has higher ends, comes to her like to Gwendolen, through a man, Felix Holt. But Esther's probation is not half so painful as that of Mrs. Grandcourt, for her admonisher becomes her husband, and her comparatively short trial ends in happiness.

No such happiness is granted to Romola, the heroine of G. Eliot's only historical novel. In her character the author tried to show how it is possible to live a life worth living, even when our dearest hopes are disappointed and our hearts cruelly wounded.

A girl brought up in learned seclusion from the interests of actual life, knowing neither heart-cutting sorrow nor overflowing joy and happiness, perfectly ignorant of everything outside her father's books, this is Romola at the age of seventeen. Now and then there came hours for her in which she felt how dreary and colourless a life like hers was "which had nothing inherited but memories — memories of a dead mother, of a lost brother, a blind father's happier time — memories of a far-off light, love and beauty, that lay embedded in dark mines of books and could hardly give out their brightness again until they were kindled for her by the torch of some known joy." ¹⁾ Then she felt a half-conscious, yet ardent yearning for a change. That change was brought about by Tito Melema, a young Greek scholar. By him Romola learnt to know what love was, that power of a strong nature which sees in the beloved object the ideal of all perfection. "I do love you", she assures him, "I know now what it is to be happy. ¹⁾ Everything I had felt before in all my life . . . was a preparation to love you. ²⁾ You have crowned my poor life" ³⁾ Romola, so proud and self-controlled to every one else, becomes simple and unreserved in her love for Tito whose bright life makes her thirsty for a deep draught of joy. But after a short time of happiness the baseness of Tito's character becomes so evident that Romola who can only love whom she esteems, shrinks from her husband and despises him. And

If love is not worth loving then life is not worth living,
Nor aught is worth remembering, but well forgot. ⁴⁾

Romola wants to forget and to be forgotten. She makes up her mind to quit her husband, to leave her native town and to hide her broken love and life in an unknown place. But she is stopped by Savonarola. "My daughter, you must return," he says to her. "You chose the bond (of marriage), and in willingly breaking it you break a pledge. Of what wrongs will you complain when you yourself are breaking the simplest law that lies at the foundation of the trust which binds man to man — faithlessness to the spoken word?" ⁵⁾ Romola, though shaken by these words, is yet at first inwardly

¹⁾ *Romola* vol. I p. 65.

²⁾ *Rom.* vol. I p. 199.

³⁾ *Ibid.* p. 221.

⁴⁾ Ch. Rossetti: *Time flies*.

⁵⁾ *Rom.* vol. II p. 63.

rebellious against them. But by and by she comes to understand "that she can forsake her duties and choose not to have the sorrow they bring, but will only find sorrow without duty". She returns to Florence and to her husband to begin a new life, but in spite of all her efforts she soon becomes conscious that she and her husband are hopelessly alienated from each other, that they must walk apart unto the end. What compensation can there be for Romola who feels clearly "that the chief relation of her life has been no more than a mistake, that the deepest secret of human blessedness has half whispered itself to her and then for ever passed her by?" ¹⁾ Savonarola who personifies for her the highest motives, teaches her that now the problem of her life must be "to keep alive that flame of unselfish emotions by which a life of sadness might well be a life of active love." ²⁾ It is a hard task for Romola whose nature has still large claims and struggles against their denial. She has, besides, no innate love for the sick and the poor, and her education has kept her aloof from such charitable duties. But by and by she becomes well-known in all those places in which misery and suffering have their abode. And the more the gulf between herself and Tito is widening, the more she feels consolation in her work of womanly sympathy. Then new great probations come over her. She has only to experience that her husband is still worse than she had thought him to be, but her confidence in the Frate in whom she had put all her trust, is also shaken. With her faith in Savonarola all her noble aspirations seem to have gone. She longs to be delivered from all cares and obligations. And once more she flees from Florence and from her husband. Nobody stops her this time. She gets into a small boat, lies down in it, and drifts away on the dark waves of the Mediterranean. But when awakening from her lethargy she finds that she has not been able to escape sorrow, her boat has brought her to a small island whose inhabitants are stricken with the plague. From the moment she sees the misery of the poor people, she feels an energetic impulse to answer the call of need. She recognises that her desire to free herself from all bonds was selfish, that once more she must begin anew. "If everything else is doubtful," she says to herself, "this suffering that I can help is certain; if the glory of the cross is an illusion, the sorrow is only the truer. While the light visits my eyes they shall seek the forsaken." ³⁾ With this resolution she goes back to her native town, when her help is no longer wanted in the island. She finds her husband no more alive; he had died a miserable death, but he has left a girl whom he had deceived and seduced, and several children. Romola's first care is to provide for them. She never tells them what were her relations to Tito, but she is anxious to educate his children in such a way as to stifle in them those dangerous inclinations that had ruined their father. "We can only have the highest happiness," she teaches them, "by having wide thoughts and much feeling for the rest of the world as well as ourselves, and this sort of happiness often brings so much pain with it, that we can only tell it from pain by its being what we would choose before everything else, because our souls see it is good." ⁴⁾ Romola, after the disappointments of her marriage, has chosen this happiness. Thus the evening of her life is calm and serene. She has much lost, but also much gained. She has much

¹⁾ *Romola*, vol. I, p. 220.

²⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 98.

³⁾ *Rom.*, II p. 285.

⁴⁾ J. W. Cross, *G. Eliot's Life*, vol. II p. 97.

suffered and has therefore much to give according to the poet's words: "Whoso suffers most, has most to give". (H. E. Hamilton-King.)

The writing of *Romola* "ploughed" into G. Eliot more than any of her other books. "I began it a young woman," she says, "and finished it an old woman". In spite of all the pains she took, she herself was obliged to acknowledge that the delineation of *Romola's* character was not exactly what she wanted it to be. "I am not surprised at your dissatisfaction with *Romola* herself", she writes to R. H. Hutton, the critic. "I can well believe that the many difficulties belonging to the treatment of such a character have not been overcome, and that I have failed to bring out my conception with adequate fulness. I am sorry she has attracted you so little, for the great problem of her life which essentially coincides with a chief problem in *Savonarola*, is one that readers need helping to understand."¹) The problem of *Romola's* life is clear enough, but her character is not easily to be understood. Is there not sometimes too much self-sacrifice on the one side and too much self-will on the other?

Romola's married life is full of disappointments. So is that of *Dorothea Brooke* in *Middlemarch*. She discovers that her husband is neither a Milton nor a Spinoza as she thought, but a pedantic, egoistic and nervous scholar. *Dorothea* like *Romola* tries to find the fault of the misunderstanding between her husband and herself entirely in her own nature, and exerts herself in sacrifices. Yet like *Tito*, her husband dies without having understood her, but while *Romola* finds another happiness in the works of charity, *Dorothea* whose ardour is alternating between "a vague ideal and the common yearnings of womanhood" yields to the latter, and marries her cousin little later than a year after her husband's death. *Dorothea's* full nature had demanded "an epic life". But owing to the meanness of opportunities and to her unfavourable surroundings, hers became one of mistakes, though not an unhappy one. Her strength instead of centring in some long-recognisable deed spent itself in channels which had no great name on the earth.²)

Dorothea's wings of aspiration were clogged by her uncongenial surroundings. In this respect *Maggie Tulliver* in *The Mill on the Floss*, perhaps the most attractive of G. Eliot's female characters, bears resemblance to her. For in *Maggie*, too, we are shown the unfavourable influence exercised upon a lofty nature by the collision with characters of a baser composition. *Maggie*, the only daughter of the owner of *Dorlcote Mill*, developed from an unpromising child into an exceptional beauty. Interesting as her appearance is, her inner life is still more so. The key-note in her character is a strong desire to love and to be loved. Hence her continual craving for somebody who should be all to her and to whom she should be everything likewise. The first objects on whom *Maggie* concentrates her ardent love, are her father and her brother. When with her advancing years these idols of her life, saddened and embittered, correspond less to her love, she who cannot live without loving, gives her affection to *Philip Wakem*, a highly gifted, but deformed young man. *Maggie* believes that this love possesses all the qualities of a genuine, all-absorbing, life-filling love. But when she makes the acquaintance of *Stephen Guest*, she becomes aware that her love for *Philip* is only the outcome of her innate affection for all unhappy beings and of her gratitude for invaluable help extended to her by *Philip*. *Maggie's* love for *Stephen* who appeals to her hot blood and her sensuous

¹) J. W. Cross, *G. Eliot's Life*, vol. II p. 97.

²) Morris: *Love is enough*.

love of beauty is ardent and passionate; it "sprang without sowing and grew without heeding,"¹⁾ it takes possession of all her faculties and makes her forget everything else.

Intense love generally originates in a passionate heart, and Maggie's is passionate. Noble longings associate themselves in her with wayward foibles. Opposite tendencies pull her in different directions. Very early she has to experience the conflict between the inward impulse and the outward fact, between temperament and principle. Her passionate nature makes her strive after too high a flight from which she comes down with her half-fledged wings dabbled in the mud. These bitter disappointments often have an almost paralysing effect on Maggie, for she is one of

The souls by nature pitched too high,
By suffering plunged too low.

Her impulsive disposition, too, explains the spiritual exaltation and consequent change effected in her by reading "The Imitation of Christ." For some time Maggie's cravings find satisfaction in her self-chosen mortification. But because this sudden change is unnatural, it cannot last, and she who believes herself to have entirely overcome all wordly temptations, soon finds herself again in a stern conflict between sense and soul, between her passions and those of others. Poor Maggie! She generally rushed to her actions with passionate impulse, but when the deed was done, she saw not only all the consequences of her imprudence, but also what would have happened, had she acted differently. The bitter sense of the irrevocable is an almost every-day experience for her, till death takes from her the possibility of erring and falling again.

Maggie's passionate temperament, her craving affection and her sensuous love of beauty render her highly sensitive. She deeply appreciates every act of kindness, but she resents as much every hard look or word, not only for herself but also for others.

Maggie's mental disposition with its strong feelings and its great susceptibility is exceptional. Her intellectual endowments are quite in keeping with it. "The little wench is trice as 'cute as Tom, too 'cute for a woman."²⁾ Books are her greatest favourites. Her short stay in a boarding-school increases her desire for knowledge. Yet her father's bankruptcy deprives her of all means of extending her studies. Only Tom's school-books are left, but Maggie does not mind their dealing with subjects quite alien to her. She soon masters the first difficulties of Latin and geometry, and even finds interest in the dry forms of syllogism. Next to books music has a special attraction for Maggie. It seems to infuse strength into her limbs and ideas into her brains; it makes her forget all her mortal wants, sorrows and burdens, but also renders her weak for resistance, and allows her feelings to get the better of her will. This great susceptibility for music points to another characteristic feature: to her vivid imagination, for imagination is the basis for the delight in all arts. The "little wench" already likes to live in a world of her own, and this peculiar intense power of repeating and refashioning it when the outside objects have gone, remains strong in her during all her life. Maggie's emotional and intellectual faculties are far more developed than those of most other girls. But alas! Her intensity of feeling, her noble endowments of mind, only tend to make her

¹⁾ Morris: *Love is enough*.

²⁾ *The Mill on the Floss*, vol. I p. 9.

life a burden to herself, a riddle to others. Very early she has to experience

The dire strife
Of poor humanity's afflicted will,
Struggling in vain with ruthless destiny.¹⁾

Her ruthless destiny is to be cast into entirely uncongenial surroundings, to grow up in a family in which her high-aspiring soul does not find the slightest sympathy. And as the most promising plant must wither and die when the soil does not agree with it, so Maggie's faculties hemmed in on all sides, seem only to realize their impotence. Thus in spite of her magnificent gifts or perhaps just on account of them, she remains a stranger among those with whom she is living. She cannot find her place in life and "her blind unconscious yearning for something that would link together the wonderful impressions of this mysterious life and give her soul a sense of home in it"²⁾ is only satisfied in eternity.

None of G. Eliot's characters has been so often criticised as Maggie. Among the unfavourable verdicts passed upon her, that of Ruskin is remarkable: "There is no girl alive, fairly clever, half educated and unluckily related, whose life has not at least as much in it as Maggie's, to be described and to be pitied."³⁾ But is not the single fact that so many readers follow Maggie's fate with intense sympathy a strong proof against his opinion? Sir Edward Lytton pointed out that so noble a girl as Maggie could not well fall in love with that average gentleman Stephen Guest. But why not? Simple Seth Bede says: "We cannot love just where other folks 'ud have us," and a French proverb: "Le coeur a des raisons que la raison ne connaît pas." Both words can be applied to Maggie's case. Her love for Stephen, though it does not elevate her character, is not inconsistent with it. G. Eliot herself considered Maggie's position towards Stephen Guest as so vital a part that she could not be converted to the condemnation of it. The objections of critics to Maggie's character, however, are outweighed by the praise bestowed upon her by connoisseurs. Swinburne speaks of her as of "one of the sweetest and tenderest as well as subtlest examples of dramatic analysis,"⁴⁾ and Leslie Stephen holds that Maggie is worth a wilderness of Dinahs. They are right; for with a master-hand G. Eliot has drawn Maggie in all her phases, from her childhood to her death. She becomes a child with the child Maggie. She shares her joys and her sorrows. She feels with the young girl all her hard disappointments, and she is present at her struggles. Another charm in the presentation of this character is the skilful adaptation of nature as a background to Maggie's varying moods. The happy child Maggie indulging in fanciful dreams, sits at the "Round Pool", that wonderful mysterious pool, framed in with willows and tall reeds which seem to whisper with the dark green water. Maggie in her love for Philip Wakem is shown to us in spring in the "Red Deeps", where pale pink dog-roses in thick clusters surround the green hollows, where tiny bells and wild hyacinths are growing at the feet of the grand Scotch firs, where insects are humming and birds are jubilating. Maggie's last struggle, however, takes place in autumn, in a boat driving on the swollen river, not far from the daisied fields in which she and her brother had roamed, their little hands clasped in love when they were little ones.

¹⁾ J. W. Cross, *G. Eliot's Life*, vol. II p. 206.

²⁾ *The Mill*, vol. I p. 323.

³⁾ *Nineteenth Century*, 1881. *Fiction fair and foul*.

⁴⁾ J. W. Cross, *G. Eliot's Life*, vol. II p. 9 + 10.

In Gwendolen, Romola and Maggie G. Eliot delineated the dying to self of young creatures who are full of strength and of eagerness to live, but give up high and pure joys and the happiness to which they cling with passionate impulse. Yet they have their faults, and renunciation is not easy to them, we witness many a hot strife before the final victory is gained.

There are but few novelists who created so many clear-cut and intensely personal female characters as G. Eliot has done. She quickly learned how to avoid the mistakes which critics had pointed out in her first creations, and she soon mastered the difficult art of perfectly discriminating characters from each other, of drawing life-like figures. The women she sets before us in their action and their suffering are such as to make us feel that thus and not otherwise they must have felt and thought and spoken under these circumstances.

But art alone did not satisfy G. Eliot. "My function", she writes, "is that of the aesthetic, the rousing of nobler emotions." ¹⁾ Therefore she was anxious to make her creations, and especially her female ones, her messengers to mankind. They should remind us of the responsibility to do good by word and deed and to lessen the evil in the world. In this double quality of artist and aesthetic G. Eliot succeeded in attaining what was Lydgate's ambition:

"To do worthy the writing and to write
Worthy the reading and the world's delight." ²⁾

Gleiwitz, Upper Silesia.

MARIA E. KAWA.

The Dialectal Distribution of certain Phonological Features in Middle English.

Section IV.

Old English \check{y} and $\check{y} +$ front consonant.

§ 115. General View. At the end of the O.E. period, the situation with regard to the development of the O.E. vowel \check{y} may be summed up as follows: over the greater part of the country \check{y} remains unchanged. In Kent and Suffolk, — presumably also in Essex — \check{y} had become \check{e} ; there are traces of e even in Cambridge.

In two districts isolative unrounding had already begun — in Devon, and in a small group of counties in the South Midlands: Oxford, Herts., and apparently Middlesex; Bucks. must have belonged to this area, but the only O.E. charter is too early (903) to be of any use here.

In M.E., Old English \check{y} appears as u all over the west and central midlands and the south-west; it is unrounded to i in the north-east midlands; and it appears as e in the south-east. This last type spreads towards the north during the M.E. period. By the 13th century the South-Western i -type (which appears to have developed in Devonshire (§ 151): in Late O.E.) has spread into Wilts., (§ 149) apparently through Dorset and part of Somerset. A hundred years later it is well-established in Hampshire (§ 147). By this time (14th cent.) the u -type has become more common than the i -type in Devon and Wilts.; the two types must have co-existed since the O.E. period.

¹⁾ J. W. Cross, *G. Eliot's Life*, vol. II p. 461.

²⁾ *Middlemarch*, p. 323.

Berks. (§ 146) agrees with Hants. in having *u* in the 13th century, but unlike Hants. it does not adopt the western *i*. The *u*-type seems to have been the only one in use in Cheshire, Shropshire, Stafford and Warwick, and there is a large proportion of *u* to *i*-forms in Hereford, Worcester and Gloucester; these three counties have only *u* in the 14th century.

In the 13th century, Lincoln, Rutland, Nottingham and Hunts. are *i*-counties; Leicester has rather more *u* than *i*-forms; Northants. has both types in equal proportions. In the 14th century the proportion of *u* to *i*-forms has increased in Notts., Leicester and Northants., but Lincoln and Hunts. still have only *i*. Norfolk has nearly always *i*, but *e*-forms have begun to come in from the south even in the 13th century. Cambridge has usually *i*, but also *e* fairly often. Suffolk has only *e* in the 13th century, but in the 14th a few *i* and *u*-forms appear also. Essex has principally *e* with a fair number of *i*-forms; in the 14th century *e* is still the commonest spelling, *u* rather more common than *i*. In the South-east, Kent has more *e* than *u*-forms, Sussex more *u* than *e*. Surrey is practically a pure *u*-county (agreeing in this point with Berks. and Hants.), but there are slight traces of *i* and *e*.

The question of the isolative unrounding in the south-midlands is discussed below (§ 118). There is some evidence for the co-existence of the *i* and the *u*-types in M.E. in Oxford, Bucks., Beds., and particularly in Herts. and Middlesex; and though the *i*-type seems to disappear fairly early in Oxford, Bucks., Beds., and Herts., it remains in London as the leading type, and spreads southwards from there into Surrey and Sussex.

The counties that seem to have unrounding of *y* before a front cons. in M.E. are Devon, Dorset, Hants., Wilts., Berks., and to a less extent Somerset.

The outline given above agrees in nearly every case with the results arrived at by Professor Wyld (*Engl. Str.* 47, 1913). The chief points of difference are as follows: part of Essex seems to have had the *i*-type alongside of the *e*-type in the 13th century; the *e*-type seems to have penetrated into Norfolk as early as the 13th century. (Professor Brandl includes Norfolk among the *i*-*e* counties — *Geogr.* p. 71 — but the traces of *e* are very slight.) Surrey has a few examples of *e* beside the usual *u* and the occasional *i*.

Herts. and Middlesex have certainly, as Professor Brandl states (*Geogr.* p. 70), *u* with a strong admixture of *i* and *e*; it is probable that, as Herts. lost the *i*-type in the 14th century, so Middlesex lost the *u*-type to a great extent. If the Westminster Register (M.S. Cott. Faustina A. III; late 13th or early 14th century) really represents the London dialect of the period, the *i*-forms (§ 141) would seem to have been at that date as frequently used as they are in Chaucer's prose, less than a century later. In the Westm. Reg. the *e*-type is conspicuously absent; *u* is very rare.

Heuser attributes the London *i* to a M.E. process of unrounding (*Alt-London*, p. 39). See also on this point Luick — *Historische Grammatik*, Liefg IV p. 410 — who assumes a gradual unrounding of [y] all over the West Midland and Saxon territories in the 14th and early 15th centuries. This is not supported by the evidence of the Place-Names; the *u*-area shows a distinct tendency to enlarge its boundaries during the 14th century, which would hardly be the case if [y] were in process of being unrounded. The *i*-forms of the literary texts of the W. Midlands seem to be explained more easily by the influence of the literary (London) dialect, than by any purely local development.

§ 115. The West-Midlands.

Lancashire (§ 120) is decidedly an *u*-county: I have very little material for the 13th century (only 9 *u* and 3 *i*), but Professor Wyld gives the following figures from the 13th century *Cockersand Chartulary*: 186 *u*; 63 *i*; 7 *e* (*Engl. Stn.* p.p. 9—11). The forms given below from the 14th century *Whalley Coucher Book* show a similar result, though here there is a still larger proportion of *u* to *i* (79 *u*: 5 *i*).

The *u*-type predominates in Cheshire (§ 121), Shropshire (§ 123), Stafford (§ 122), Worcester (§ 125) and Warwick (§ 126). Worcester has a few *i*-forms (in unstressed syllables) in the 13th century, but none at all in the 14th. In the 13th century Hereford (§ 124) and Glos. (§ 127) both have *u* with some *i*-forms (4 times as many *u* as *i* in Hereford; 7 times as many *u* as *i* in Glos.) In the 14th century the *i*-spellings have almost vanished.

In none of these counties is there any evidence in M.E. Place-Name forms for the unrounding of *y* before a front cons. I can give no material to illustrate this point in O.E. in Lancs., Cheshire, Staffs., Shropshire or Warwick. Gloucester seems to have 2 unrounded forms in 10th century charters; and Worcester, in the same period has 19 *y* to 10 *i*-forms. The 11th century Worcester Chartulary (Tiberius A. xiii) has 51 *y*-forms to 9 *i*. This large proportion of *y* to *i* suggests that the 10th century *i*-forms may be due to W. Saxon influence.

§ 116. East Midlands. Lincoln (§ 128), Notts. (§ 129), Rutland (§ 130), and Hunts. (§ 131), have only *i* in the 13th century. Norfolk (§ 133) has *i* with an occasional *e* (13 *i*: 3 *e*). Cambridge (§ 134) has generally *i* but also a fair number of *e*-forms. This county has one example of *e* as early as the 10th century: *Westmenstre* Birch 1306 (c. 974). Suffolk (§ 135) has *e*, and *i* rarely. By the 14th century the *e*-type must have been pretty widespread in Lincolnshire, judging by the number of *e*-forms that appear in Robert of Brunne (c. 1300—30) (*Wyld: Essays and Studies* VI p. 123). I have found none at all in the Pl.Ns., but Professor Wyld gives three examples, two dated 1303, and one 1316 (*E. Stn.* 47, p. 25). The Norfolk Pl. Ns. of the 14th century agree with the Norfolk Gilds (1389), which beside the usual *gylde*, *fyrste*, *biryed*, etc., also have *gelde*, *ferst*, *kechen*, *menstre*, etc. Cambridge in the 14th century seems to have all three types — *u*, *i*, and *e* — but my material is far too scanty to afford any real evidence. Professor Brandl includes this county in the *i-e* area (*Geogr.* p. 72).

Huntingdon (§ 131) retains the *i*-type in the 14th century; my material shows very slight traces of *e* (16 *i*: 2 *e*). The 14th cent. Ramsey Cartulary shows a still smaller proportion of *e*-forms, the figures being 18 *u*: 132 *i*: 1 *e*. (*Wyld: Engl. Stn.* 47, p.p. 26-8). Northants (§ 136) seems to have been originally an *i*-county, to judge by the forms in the Peterborough Chronicle: *fir*, *minstre*, *byrigde*, *ifele*, *briggses*, etc. There are a few examples of *e* beside the usual *i* even in the Peterborough Chron. (*Wyld: Essays and Studies* VI). A 10th cent. Northants. charter (Kemble 399) has the form *embegang*.

In the 13th century the *u* and *i*-forms are about equal in number, but I have found no *e*-forms. In the 14th century *u* is rather more common than *i*; *e* is rare.

Suffolk in the 14th century has usually *e*, but *i* and *u* occasionally. Bokenam's *Lives of Saints* in the following century (c. 1440) has generally *e* (*Wyld: Essays and Studies* VI p. 126).

§ 117. The South-East. It seems only natural to suppose that in the O.E. period Essex shared with Kent and Suffolk the development of

\bar{y} to \bar{e} , though we have at present no evidence from O.E. documents to support such a theory. But the few O.E. charters have hardly a trace of any deviation from the W. Saxon type, and cannot represent the dialect of Essex with any degree of accuracy. The e -type is by far the most common in the M.E. period: the 13th cent. Colchester Chartulary has 35 e to 10 i and 3 u ; the 14th century documents yield 21 e to 12 u and 5 i (§ 137). If the forms in the Colch. Chart. are genuine, it is difficult to account for the comparatively large proportion of i -forms, and the apparently sudden reduction in their number in the following century. Colchester is, however, in the northern part of the county, and it may well be that i rather than u was, along with e , the common form in the north, though not in the south of the county. This supports Professor Wyld's suggestion that the early 13th century *Vices and Virtues* is written in the dialect of North Essex (*Essays and Studies* VI, p. 130—133); this text has i and \bar{e} (ie) for O.E. \bar{y} ; generally e but also i for O.E. \bar{y} (u is rare).

Kent has a fair number of examples of \bar{e} for \bar{y} in the O.E. period (§ 138). In the 13th and 14th centuries e is the commoner spelling, though u is used fairly frequently. Sussex (§ 139) has u more often than e until the 15th century, when the proportion (to judge by the material given below) is 39 e to 28 u and 12 i . The i -forms appear first in the 14th century, having apparently spread southwards from Middlesex. Surrey (§ 140) is certainly an u -county, though there are traces of i and e as early as the 13th century, in the Chertsey Chartulary. This agrees with the occasional e -spellings in the *Owl and the Nightingale* (Wyld: *English Studies* vol. III. No. 2).

§ 118. The South-Midlands. London and Middlesex have all three types — i , e and u (Wyld: *Engl. Scr.* p. 54. Heuser: *Alt-London* p. 23). The presence of the i -forms in a district apparently surrounded by u or e -counties has always been a difficulty. Heuser states that the i -forms appear before 1200 (*Alt-London*, p. 32), and he looks upon them as the result of a M.E. unrounding of $[y]$ — a theory which seems untenable in face of the fact that there is no sign of a corresponding unrounding in Norman-French words with $[y]$.

The following suggestion affords a possible solution of the problem:

It has been pointed out above (§ 115) that two districts show signs of isolative unrounding in the O.E. period — Devon, and a part of the south midlands including Oxford and Herts., or part of these counties. A 10th century Middlesex charter has *Westminster* Birch 1048 (959); this is not very valuable evidence, since here the unrounded vowel occurs before n ; but as a matter of fact the O.E. *mynstre* never appears with i in W. S. charters. The unrounding in Devonshire, though there is a gap in the records of nearly two hundred years, is well evidenced in M.E. The E.M.E. forms from Oxford (§ 145) and Herts. (§ 142) correspond in a similar manner with the traces of unrounding in O.E. Bucks. (§ 144) and Beds. (§ 143) both have i as well as u in the 12th and 13th centuries. These four counties, or rather the southern portions of them, together with London and Middlesex, apparently formed in the 10th century an outlying part of English Mercia; it included that territory, the boundaries of which were indicated in the document known as *Alfred and Guthrum's Frith* (886): "up the Lea to its source, then straight across to the Ouse at Bedford, then along the Ouse to Watling Street." (Oman: *England before the Norman Conquest*, p. 466). This piece of country was won back by Alfred from the Danes at that date, soon after the fortification of London. It was bounded on the north by

Danish Mercia, on the south by Wessex proper, and on the west by the forest of Wychwood, the old dividing line between the Chilternsætas of Bucks. and East Oxford, and the Hwiccas of the West Midlands. Within this territory, separated from the Danelagh by the peace of 886, Middlesex and London itself were included. It is possible that, within the limits indicated above, a tendency to unround *y* developed in the 10th century — a tendency shared by the dialect of London. If this were so, the numerous *i*-forms in London English were not due to a M.E. unrounding, nor introduced from Anglian, but the descendants of a genuine O.E. *i*-type.

§ 119. The South-West. The *i* from O.E. *y* which appears in Devonshire in the 10th century (*hirnan* Kemble 369; *litlan* Kemble 534) seems to have developed steadily through the 11th and 12th centuries, and to be represented by the 13th century *i* which is the commoner type in Devon (§ 151), is fairly well established in Dorset (§ 148) and Wilts. (§ 147), and is found to some extent in Somerset (§ 150). Both the *u* and the *i*-types must have existed in Devon at this time, since in the 14th century *u* is more common than *i*, and has practically ousted the *i*-type in Wilts. and Somerset. But while Hants. has no *i*-forms at all in the 13th century, in the 14th they are more frequently used than the *u*-forms. Berkshire is decidedly an *u*-county throughout the period (§ 146).

A tendency to lower this *i* to *e* is observable in the 13th and 14th centuries in Devon, Dorset, Wilts. and Somerset. These *e*-forms are confirmed, for the South-Western area, by the spellings in Trevisa (Pfeffer: *Die Spr. des Polychr.* §§ 48, 74): the usual spelling is *u* (*uy* when long) but *e* is fairly frequent: *hull*; *kuste*; *buryede*; *mury*; *vurste*; *anuyr*; *huydep*; *luyltel*; etc. — *menester*; *verste*; *menchyn*; *folfelled*; etc.

The South-western counties all have *i* for O.E. *y* before a front consonant. This unrounding appears also in O.E. Devonshire in the 13th century has 12 *i* and no *u*; Dorset 3 *i* and 1 *u*; Hants. 12 *i* to 2 *u*. Somerset has more *u* than *i*-forms in this position, but the proportion of *i* to *u* is greater before a front cons. than under other conditions.

§ 120. Lancashire. 13th cent. Cal. Inq. -*hull* (5); -*buri* (1). — -*biry* (2); *Milne*- (1).

14th cent. Whal. Cou. Bk. -*hull* (40); *Hull*- (1); *bury* (29); *Hurst*- (5); -*hurst* (5). — -*hill*- (1); *Milne*- (1); *Mit*- (2) (O.E. *gemyðan*); *Rysch*- (1); -*brigge* (2).

§ 121. Cheshire. 13th cent. Cal. Inq. I: -*buri* (4); -*hul* (1); -*hurst* (1); *Rush*- (1).

14th cent. Whal. Con. Bk. *Hurst* (3); -*bury* (4); *Brugge*- (5). — -*mylne* (2).

§ 122. Stafford. 10th cent. Birch 978 (956): *lytlan* (2).

11th cent. Kemble 710 (1004); *mynster* (1); -*hyll* (1).

13th cent. Staff. For. Pleas (1250—86): *Hul*- (11); -*hull* (26); -*buri* (30); *Putt*- (8); -*hurst* (4); *Mule*- (2); *Rush*- (9); -*rugge* (1). — -*hill* (1); -*byri* (2); -*brigge* (1); -*rigge* (1).

14th cent. Staff. For. Pleas (1300); *Hul*- (2); -*hull* (7); -*bury* (4); *Dru*- (O.E. *dryge*) (1); -*brug* (3); *Rugge*- (2); *Russ*- (3). Rydeware Cart. *Hul*- (2); -*hulle* (4); -*buri* (26); -*put* (3); *Luttel*- (1). — -*beri* (1).

§ 123. Shropshire. 13th cent. Forest Pl. -*hull* (1); -*bury* (1); *Brug*- (2); -*Rugge* (1); *Rush*- (1). Cal. Inq. -*hulle* (1); -*hurst* (4); -*bury* (5); *Mule*- (2); *Brug*- (3); -*brugg* (1). Shavington Mun. -*hull* (3).

14th cent. Shavington Mun. -*hul* (1). Brit. Mus. Cott. XXIX 20 (1369): -*hulle* (1).

§ 124. Hereford. 10th cent. Birch 1040 (958): *myle-* (2); *-brycge* (1).
11th cent. Kemble 755 (1038): *mynstre* (1). Kemble 882 (1056): *cynn* (1);
-hyll (1); *mynstre* (1).

13th cent. Reg. T. de Cant. *-bury* (93); *Hulle* (4); *-hulle* (23); *Putte* (2);
-hurste (2); *Mule-* (2); *Gilde-* (3); *Brug-* (7); *-brugge* (8); *-rugge* (3). —
byry (30); *-minstre* (33). — *-bery* (1); *menestre* (2).

14th cent. Cal. Inq. *-hull* (2); *-bury* (2); *Brugge-* (3). — *-biri* (1); Cat.
Anc. Dds *Brug-* (2).

15th cent. From deeds in the Brit. Mus. *-hull* (2); *-bury* (1). Cat. Anc.
Dds. *-bury* (1). Cal. Inq. *-brugge* (2). — *-mynstre* (2).

§ 125. Worcester. 9th cent. Kemble 237 (836); *-byrig* (2). Kemble 305
(c. 872): *byrig* (1).

10th cent. Kemble 548 (969): *byrg* (2); *pyt* (4). Birch 1233 (955); *gebyrd*
(1); *brygc* (1). Kemble 570 (972): *lytlan* (1); *pyt* (7); *-hyl* (3); *-hyrst* (1);
mynster (1); *-byrg* (1); *-rycg* (16); *-brycg* (2) — *risc-* (4); *hricg-* (6). Sweet:
2nd Reader 34 (984): *hyll* (2); *fyrh* (4); *mylen* (1).

11th cent. Kemble 724 (1016): *pyt* (2); *hyll* (1); *brycge* (2). Kemble 764
(1042): *hyrst* (2); *rycg-* (1). Kemble 765 (1042): *byriað* (1). Tiberius A. xiii
(11th cent.): *gebyriað* (2); *cype* (1); *hype* (1); *lytlan* (14); *gemyðan* (9);
gebyrd (2); *byrigels* (3); *byrig* (12); *kyne-* (1); *-cynn* (1); *hyll* (25); *Hymel-*
(1); *hyrst* (2); *mylen-* (2); *mynstre* (2); *pyt* (9); *wyrce* (1); *asyndrade* (1);
synnum (1); *wyri-* (1); *ðynnest* (1); *brycg* (22); *byht* (4); *dryhtnes* (1);
hrycge (21); *-stycce* (4). — *-biri* (1); *brigge* (2); *drihten* (3); *rigcce* (2);
risc- (5).

13th cent. Worcs. Reg. *Hull-* (9); *-hull* (29); *Mul-* (3); *Hurste* (2); *-put*
(2); *-bury* (2); *Brugge* (1); *-brug* (3); *Rugge-* (4); *-rugge* (21). — *-hill* (4);
-pit (1); *-biŕ* (5).

14th cent. Cal. Inq. V *Hulle* (1); *-hull* (6); *-buri* (3); *-thurne* (1); *-rugge* (7).

§ 126. Warwick. 9th cent. Birch 560 (889); *byrig* (1).

10th cent. Napier VIII (998): *gemyðan* (1); *pytte* (3); *hyll* (1).

11th cent. Kemble 705 (1001): *lytlan* (1); *hyllæ* (1).

13th cent. Cal. Inq. *Hulle* (1); *-hull* (1); *-bury* (1); *-mulne* (1); *Put-* (1);
-put (3).

14th cent. Cal. Inq. *-bury* (3); *Putt-* (1); *-hull* (11); *-brugge* (1).

15th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *-bury* (1); *Mury-* (1); *-hull* (2); *-brugge* (2). —
Miry (1).

§ 127. Gloucester. 9th cent. Kemble 243 (c. 840): *-hyl* (2).

10th cent. Kemble 385 (940): *-hyrst* (3). Kemble 426 (949): *-pyt* (2);
byrig (3). — *risc-* (2).

13th cent. Flax. Cart. *Hull-* (2); *-hulle* (2); *-buri* (8); *Munster-* (6). —
Mille- (1); *Little-* (1); *-hill* (13); *-biri* (13). — *-beri* (1). Glos. Cart. *Hull-* (11);
-hulle (46); *-bury* (88); *-hurst* (13); *-hurne* (7); *putte* (11); *Mule-* (1); *-mulne*
(13); *Munstre-* (8); *Lulle-* (8); *Ruy-* (1); *Brug-* (6); *-brugge* (25); *Rugge-* (31);
-rugge (25). — *-biri* (6); *Mynster-* (2); *-pitta* (1); *Lille-* (1); *-brigge* (2). —
beri (1).

14th cent. Cal. Inq. *Hulle* (1); *-hull* (2); *-hurst* (1); *Munstre-* (2); *-buri* (10).

15th cent. Glos. Hist. *-bury* (20); *Putt* (1); *-putte* (1); *-hurst* (3); *-mulle*
(2); *Munstre-* (2); *Lulle-* (1); *Rugge* (6); *-rugge* (2); *-brugge* (8). — *Lyttel*
(1); *-biri* (1). — *bery* (1).

§ 128. Lincoln. 13th cent. From M.S.S. in the Brit. Mus. *-milne* (1);
-brige (1). Cal. Inq. *-hill* (4); *Milne-* (1); *-mylne* (1); Linc. Lib. Ant. *-brigg* (3).

14th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *-brig* (1). Cal. Inq. *-hill* (7); *Milne*- (2); *-brigg* (4).
15th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *-pit* (1).

§ 129. Nottingham. 12th cent. Cal. Inq. *-hill* (1). From a Brit. Mus. charter: *-hil* (1).

13th cent. Cal. Inq. *-buri* (1) — *Brige*- (2). From a M.S. in the Brit. Mus. *-hil* (1); *Brig*- (1).

14th cent. Forest Pl. *Mulne*- (1). — *brigge* (1). Cal. Inq. *Mulne*- (2); *-hull* (6); — *Brig*- (1).

§ 130. Rutland. 13th cent. Forest Pl. *Brigge*- (1); *-brigge* (2).

14th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Brig*- (3). — *Breg*- (1).

15th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *Brig*- (4).

§ 131. Huntingdon. 13th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *-hurst* (1). — *-byry* (2); *-hyrst* (2). Select Pl. *Hurst* (2). — *Hirst* (3); *-thirne* (1); *biri* (12); *-brigge* (1); *-rigge* (1). Cal. Inq. *-bruge* (1). — *-biri* (2). Forest Pl. *Hyrst*- (2); *-biry* (18).

14th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *-hul* (1). — *-hyrst* (6); *Hill*- (1); *-hill* (1); *Mylne*- (1); *Brigge*- (7). — *-beri* (2).

15th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *-bury* (1). — *-hyrste* (3); *Mynstre*- (1); *-bryge* (1).

§ 132. Leicester. 13th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *-hul* (3); *Mulne*- (1). Leics. Rec. *Hulle* (1); *-hull* (3); *-thurne* (1). — *Thirne*- (3); *-thyrne* (1); *-hirne* (1); *-rigge* (1).

14th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *-bury* (3). — *-mynstr*' (1). Leics. Rec. *-hul* (1). — *-hill* (1); *-brigg* (1).

15th cent. Leics. Rec. *-mylne* (1); *--mynstr*' (2).

§ 133. Norfolk. 13th cent. Norw. Tax. (1254): *-hill* (1); *Ri*- (1); *Brig*- (1); *-brigg* (5). — *hele* (1); *Resse*- (1). Cal. Inq. *-hil* (1); *Mil*- (2); *Gyld*- (2); *-brigg* (4). — *Mele*- (1).

14th cent. Cal. Inq. *-hille* (1); *-byri* (1); *Brigge*- (1); *-brigge* (1). — *Ressh*- (3). Cat. Anc. Dds. *-hil* (2); *-mille* (2); *Mille*- (1); *-brigge* (2).

15th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *-hill* (5); *Hyll*- (2); *-mylle* (2); *-brigge* (1). — *-hell* (2).

§ 134. Cambridge. 10th cent. Kemble 563 (970): *gebyrð* (1); *-ðryðe* (1); *mynster* (6); *myneceum* (1); *cyne*- (2); *yfele* (1). — *bricge* (1). Birch 1306 (after 974): *-byrig* (1). — *-menstre* (1).

13th cent. Mem. Bern. *-hulle* (1). — *Hil*- (1); *-hill* (15); *Gilden*- (12); *-byri* (1). *Hyrst*- (2); *-hyrst* (2); *-hithe* (2); *Little*- (4); *Rie*- (1) (O.E. *ryge*); *Drye*- (1); *-brigge* (34); *Brige*- (8). — *-beri* (4); *-breg* (10); *Dreye*- (1); *Hethe* (1); *-hethe* (1).

14th cent. Ely Pleas: *Lutel*- (1); *Rush*- (1); *-brugge* (1). — *Ris*- (1); *Lytle*- (22); *-hill* (1). — *Lettil*- (1); *-hethe* (1). Cat. Anc. Dds. *Mele*- (2).

§ 135. Suffolk. 10th cent. Kemble 490 (962); *hyrste* (1). Sweet: 2nd Reader, 46 (after 991): *ðryð* (1); *-drype* (1); *mynstre* (3). — *brece* (4); *-pettæ* (1); *-þræpe* (1); *gefelste* (1).

13th cent. Bury Reg. Alb. *-mille* (1); *-pit* (1). — *-pet* (1); *-helle* (2); *-melle* (1); *-beri* (1); *-bregge* (1). Ipswich Rent. *Litel*- (4). — *-pet* (1); *Hel*- (2); *Gelden*- (2); *Resse*- (1). Cat. Anc. Dds. *Melne* (1); *-helle* (1); *-bregge* (1).

14th cent. Cal. Inq. *-hull* (1); *-brugg* (1); *Rusch*- (3). — *-hill* (1); *-brigge* (2). — *Pet*- (2); *-pet* (1); *-herst* (1). Cat. Anc. Dds. *Bregge* (1); *-bregge* (4); *-pet* (2); *-melne* (1).

15th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *-hel* (1); *Bregge* (2).

§ 136. Northampton. 10th cent. Kemble 399 (944): *lytle* (8); *-byrig* (7); *-hulle* (2); *-pytte* (2); *byrgels(e)* (2); *wyrt-* (1); *fyrh* (1). — *bricge* (3); *hricgge* (2). — *embegang* (1).

11th cent. Kemble 736 (1021—23): *pytt* (4); *myln* (1); *byrgelsas* (1); *-hylles* (1).

12th cent. Lib. Nig. *-hirst* (1).

13th cent. Linc. Lib. Ant. *-hull* (2); *Mule-* (2). Cat. Anc. Dds. *Hul-* (3); *-hulle* (1); *-bur'* (2). Forest Pl. — *hulle* (1); *Rus-* (1). (O.E. rusc) — *-hil* (1); *-brige* (1); *Ris-* (7).

14th cent. Cal. Inq. *Hull-* (1); *-hull* (5); *-buri* (1); *Russh-* (1). — *-hill* (1); *-biri* (1); *Gylden-* (2); *-hell* (2).

15th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *-hull* (1). — *Brigge-* (1). — *Melne-* (1).

§ 137. Essex. 10th cent. Kemble 699 (997): *cȳð* (1); *byrig* (1). Kemble 704 (c. 999): *cȳðde* (1).

11th cent. Kemble 788 (1049): *cȳð* (1); *-gȳpe* (3).

12th cent. From a Brit. Mus. charter (c. 1135): *-herst* (1).

13th cent. Colch. Chart. *Rugge-* (1); *mulne* (1); *-bruge* (1). — *-biri* (6); *Mille-* (1); *-milne* (3). — *Hele-* (1); *-helle* (2); *-herna* (1); *Pet-* (2); *-pet* (1); *-melne* (16); *-beri* (11); *Resse-* (1).

14th cent. Cal. Inq. *-bury* (4); *Mulle-* (1); *-buri* (3); *-brugge* (5). — *-biri* (1); *-brigge* (4). — *-bery* (1); *-menstre* (1); *-hel* (1); *-bregg* (8); *Reg-* (1); *Keechen-* (1). Colch. Chart. *-pete* (5). Cat. Anc. Dds. *-herst* (1); *-pet* (1).

15th cent. Cal. Inq. *-hurst* (3); *-hull* (4). — *Pitt* (2). — *-bery* (3); *-pett* (2). Colch. Chart. *-helle* (1); *-melle* (1); *-herne* (1); *-bregge* (2).

§ 138. Kent. 8th cent. O.E.T. 18 (788): — *-hyð* (1); *hyge* (1); *cyne-* (1). O.E.T. 19 (798): *hyge-* (1); *cyne-* (1); *ðryðe* (1).

9th cent. O.E.T. 33 (803): *hyg-* (1); *cyne-* (1). O.E.T. 34 (805): *-gyðe* (2); *gebycge* (1). Kemble 191 (805—31): *gebycge* (1). — *haegethe* (1). Kemble 226 (805—31): *-byrg* (2); *nytt* (2); *hyhte* (1); *ðynce* (1). O.E.T. 35 (811): *byrg* (1); *-ðryðae* (1). Kemble 204 (814): *lytlan* (1); *-hrycg* (1). O.E.T. 36 (824?): *cyne-* (1); *byrg* (1). Kemble 229 (831): — *ðryð(e)* (3); *cynnnes* (2); *ðynce* (1); *nyttlicas* (1). (This charter has *yfter* for *efter*). Kemble 235 (835): *cyðe* (1); *-gyð* (1); *cynn* (2); *nytt* (2); *mynster* (2). Kemble 238 (837): *cyðo* (1); *gemynen* (1). Kemble 281 (858): *heregeðe* (1). — *hyrst* (1).

10th cent. Kemble 477 (958): *geberige* (1); *gebærige* (1); *netwyrðan* (1). — *yfter* for *efter* (2).

11th cent. Kemble 737 (1023): *fere* (1); *berdene* (1); *kennes* (1); *menstre* (2); *gebecgan* (1). — *kinnes* (1); *byrig* (1); *gelitligene* (1). Kemble 773 (1044): *Melen-* (1). — *gebyred* (1).

13th cent. Exc. Com. *-burie* (1). — *-biri* (3). — *herst* (1); *-beri* (1). Cal. Inq. *-hull* (1); *-hurst* (3); *-buri* (2); *-brug* (2). — *Pette* (1); *Herst-* (3); *-herst* (2); *Helle* (1); *-helle* (1).

14th cent. Cal. Inq. *-hulle* (2); *-hurst* (4); *-brugge* (7). — *-hyrst* (3); *-pit* (1); *-brigge* (2). — *-bery* (4); *-helle* (2); *-herst* (10); *-mell* (1); *Pett-* (1); *-pete* (1); *-bregge* (1).

§ 139. Sussex. 10th cent. Birch 961 (956): *hyrst* (1).

13th cent. Cal. Inq. *-hurst* (3); *-brugge* (1). — *-herst* (2). *-bregge* (1). S. Mary's Chart. *-hull* (1); *-brugg* (1). — *-brigg* (1). From Brit. Mus. M.S.S. *-hurst* (3); *Putt-* (2). — *-herst* (3).

14th cent. Bat. Cust. *-hurst* (8). — *-herst* (4); *Melle-* (5). From a M.S. in the Brit. Mus. *-hurst* (4); *hulle* (4); *-hulle* (10); *mule-* (2); *putte-* (2); *Guldene-* (1); *-bur'* (1); *lutle-* (1); *-brugg* (31). — *-hilla* (1); *gilden* (3); *-rig* (2); *-brigge* (1). — *herst* (4); *geldene* (1).

15th cent. From a M.S. in the Brit. Mus. *hurst* (8); *-hurst* (11); *-mull* (3); *mule-* (1); *-brugge* (1). — *-hil* (2); *-hirst* (1); *-mille* (3); *-bire* (1); *-brigge* (5). — *-helle* (2); *-melle* (5); *-herst* (19); *-bery* (1); *-regge* (2); *-bregge* (6); *Bregg-* (1).

§ 140. Surrey. 9th cent. Kemble 287 (962): *hryg* (1). Kemble 317 (871—9): *cyðan* (1); *getrymed* (1); *-cynn* (2); *mynster* (1); *gebycge* (1).

10th cent. Birch 1198 (967): *hyrst* (1).

13th cent. Chert. Cart. *-buri* (3); *hulle* (1); *-hurst* (4); *mulle* (2); *munstre* (2); *brugge* (9); *rugge* (1). — *-brigga* (2). — *wert-* (1); *menechene* (1). Cat. Anc. Dds. *-hulle* (1); *Gulde-* (4); *-brug* (2). Forest Pl. *Gulde-* (4). — *Gilde-* (1); *-byr* (2).

14th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *-hull* (2); *-bury* (1); *Gulde-* (1); *-brüg* (1). — *-hill* (1). Forest Pl. *Gulde-* (2). Banstead Ext. (1325): *Hulle* (1); *-hulle* (2); *-mulle* (1); *-bury* (1); *-putte* (1). — *-pet* (1).

15th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *-hulle* (4). — *Pytte* (1); *-hill* (1). Cal. Inq. *Putt-* (1). — *-bery* (1).

§ 141. London and Middlesex. 10th cent. Birch 1048 (959): *-minster* (1). Birch 1063 (960—2): *fyre* (1); *-byrg* (2); *cyne-* (1). Birch 1085 (962): *-byrig* (3); *hyrste* (2); — *risc-* (1).

13th cent. Westm. Reg. *geburað* (2); *munster* (2). — *kuðe* (25); *gebireð* (8); *minstre* (22); *-minstre* (23); *milne* (3); *mirð* (1); *-byri* (4); *wrðminte* (1); *-hylle* (1); *-briche* (8).

§ 142. Hertford. 11th cent. Kemble 1353: *cȳð* (1); *-gȳðe* (1). Kemble 1354: *-ðrȳðe* (2); *-gȳðe* (1). Napier XI (1007): *-birig* (1).

13th cent. Herts. Hist. *Put-* (2); *-ruge* (1); *-muln'* (1). — *-brig* (1); *Hille* (4); *-hill* (7). *Hyrest* (1); *Little-* (4). — *-beri* (3); *-brega* (1). Cat. Anc. Dds. *-hul* (3); *-bury* (3); *Russe-* (1). — *-brigge* (1). *-beri* (2); *-melne* (7).

14th cent. Herts. Hist. *Hull(e)* (4); *-hull* (2); *Mulle-* (2). — *Rye-* (2). Cat. Anc. Dds. *-hulle* (3); *-brugge* (1). — *-hell* (1).

15th cent. Cal. Inq. *-bury* (2); *Russh-* (1); *Rugge* (1). Cat. Anc. Dds. *Rusch-* (1). — *-helle* (1); *-mell* (1).

§ 143. Bedford. 10th cent. Birch 1229 (969): *lytlan* (1); *hyll* (1); *pyrnan* (1); *pytt* (1).

12th cent. Feet of Fines I: *Hulle* (1). — *-hille* (2); *Little-* (1). — *herst* (2).

13th cent. Linc. Lib. Ant. *-hull* (4). — *-hill* (2). Cal. Inq. *-hulle* (3); *-hurst* (1); *-bruge* (1).

14th cent. Bush. Cart. *-hurst* (3); *-hull* (4); *-bury* (5). — *-herst* (1).

§ 144. Buckingham. 10th cent. Birch 603 (903): *byrge* (1); *byrgels* (1); — *hricg* (1).

12th cent. Feet of Fines I *-hulle* (5). — *-hill* (1); *-bir'* (3); *Little-* (2). — *-pete* (1).

13th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *-hulle* (1); *Mury-* (1); *-mulne* (1); *-brugge* (1); *-ruge* (1). — *-pit* (1). — *-regge* (3). Linc. Lib. Ant. (1209—35): *-hull* (1); *Mull-* (1). — *-hill* (1). Cal. Inq. *-hull* (2); *-buri* (6); *-hurst* (1); *Putte-* (1). — *-byri* (3).

14th cent. From a M.S. in the Brit. Mus. *Put-* (2); *-putte* (2); *hulle* (1); *-hulle* (68); *-mulle* (8); *mulne-* (3); — *-bury* (1); *-hurst* (7); *Little-* (1); *Rui-* (1); *-rugge* (14); *Rugge-* (3). — *Brig-* (1).

§ 145. Oxfordshire. 10th cent. Kemble 453 (956): *mylne* (2); *-pyt* (2). — *risc-* (2). Birch 945 (956): *pyt (te)* (2). Birch 1176 (966); *byrig* (1). — *birigelsan* (1). Kemble 691 (995): *gebyrað* (1).

11th cent. Kemble 714 (1005); *gebyrað* (2); *-gyðe* (1); *hyðe* (1); *cyðe* (1); *-byrig* (2); *pyt* (1); *hyrnan* (1); *hylle* (1); *-hyrste* (1). — *lillan-* (1); *-bricge* (2).

12th cent. Eynsh. Cart. *-buri* (2); *-mulle* (3); *-hurst* (5); *Pudel-* (1); *Hulle-* (1); *-hulle* (4). — *-biry* (3); *Minstre* (1). — *-beri* (15).

13th cent. Eynsh. Cart. *Hurst* (2); *-hurst* (5); *-hulle* (38); *-buri* (35); *-put* (4); *Mule-* (7); *-hurne* (4); *-huthe* (1); *Huthe-* (6); *Luttel-* (2); *Ruye-* (2); *Rugge* (1); *-brugge* (9). — *Lytle-* (1); *-biry* (31); *Minstre* (3). — *hell* (1); *beri* (2).

14th cent. Eynsh. Cart. *Hulle* (3); *-hulle* (10); *-bury* (15); *Hurst* (2); *-hurst* (7); *Mulle* (7); *-putte* (2); *Hurne* (3); *-huthe* (2); *Huthe-* (7); *Lutle-* (5); *-brugge* (3). — *Byx-* (1); *-byry* (2); *Lytle-* (1). — *-bery* (3).

15th cent. Oxf. Cart. *Hulle* (2); *-hulle* (81); *Put-* (4); *-put* (4); *-bury* (3); *Bury-* (1); *Mul-* (1); *-mulle* (2); *-hurst* (7); *Lutel-* (1); *Rus-* (2); *Brugge-* (2); *-brugge* (4). — *-hill* (3); *-myll* (1); *-hirst* (1); *mynstre* (2); *Litel-* (2); *-brigge* (1). — *-hell* (22).

§ 146. Berkshire. 10th cent. Kemble 427 (949): *mylen-* (1); *-pyttas* (1). — *rige-* (1). Birch 892 (951): *-lytlan* (2); *-pyt* (2); *byrgelsas* (1); *syrfan* (1); *-byrig* (1); *wyrt-* (1); *hrycg* (2).

13th cent. Hurley Ch. *Hulle* (1); *-hulle* (3); *-hurst* (1); *Hurn-* (1) (O.E. *hyrne*) *-huth* (1). Cal. Inq. *Hulle* (2); *-hul* (1); *-bury* (3); *-rugge* (1). — *-rigge* (2).

14th cent. Hurley Ch. *-hulle* (3); *-hurst* (10); *-put* (1); *Huthe-* (1); *-huth* (1); *Lutel-* (1). — *-hyll* (1), *Littel-* (1). — *Melne-* (1). Abing. Obed. *-hull* (7); *-bury* (4); *Mulle* (1); *-mulle* (1); *Put-* (1); *-brugge* (1). — *Gylde-* (1); *Little-* (2); *Brugge* (1); *-brigge* (1). — *-bery* (2).

15th cent. Abing. Obed. *-hull* (1); *Bury* (3); *-bury* (1); *Mulle* (1); *-mull* (5); *-huthe* (1); *-rugge* (1). — *myll* (4); *-hith* (2); *Lytle-* (1). — *bryg-* (1); *-rygge* (1).

§ 147. Hampshire. 9th cent. Kemble 272 (854): *risc-* (1).

10th cent. Birch 596 (901): *lytlan* (2); *hylle* (2); *-hyrste* (1). — *rige-* (1); *hricge* (1). Birch 1066 (961): *byrgels* (1); *pyrnan* (1). — *bricge* (1). Kemble 450 (956): *gebyret* (1); *brycge* (2).

11th cent. Kemble 781 (1045): *gebyrað* (1); *myle-* (2). *-bricge* (2).

13th cent. Crondal Rec. *Hulle* (3); *-hulle* (3). — *Rigge* (2); *-rigge* (3). Cat. Anc. Dds. *-hulle* (3). Cal. Inq. *Putte* (1); *-hull* (10); *-hurst* (4); *Rugge* (1); *-brug* (1). — *-rigg* (1); *-brigg* (6).

14th cent. Crondal Rec. *Hulle* (1); *-hulle* (1); *Hurst* (1); *-hurst* (1); *Hurne* (2). *Rugge* (3). — *-rigge* (1). Lib. de Hyda: *-hull* (3); *-bury* (4); *Gulde-* (2). — *hyll* (2); *-hyll* (5); *-mynster* (4); *mylle-* (4); *pyt-* (5); *-pittys* (1); *-byryell* (2); *lytyl* (2); *-brygg* (9). — *herne* (1).

15th cent. Cat. Anc. Dds. *-hirste* (1); *-hill* (1); *Brigg-* (1); *rygges* (1).

§ 148. Dorset. 9th cent. Kemble 260 (847): *lytlan* (1); *ðyrelan* (1); *-pytt* (1).

11th cent. Kemble 741 (1024); *hylle* (2); *hyrnan* (4); *Mule-* (1).

13th cent. Cal. Inq. *Hulle* (1); *-hulle* (5); *Mule-* (2); *-ruge* (1). — *byri* (1); *Pidele* (2) (O.E. *pydei*); *-minstre* (1); *-rigge* (3). — *-menistre* (1).

14th cent. Cerne Cart. *-hulle* (4); *Mule-* (2); *-hurst* (4); *-pudle* (3). — *-hyll* (1); *Gylden-* (1); *-bir* (4); *Brid-* (2); *-brigg* (10). — *-hell* (1).

§ 149. Wiltshire. 8th cent. Kemble 133 (778): *pytte* (2); *-hrygc* (1).

10th cent. Kemble 378 (939): *-pyt* (1); *byrgelsas* (1). — *hric-* (1). Birch 748 (940): *hylle* (1); *hyrnan* (1). Kemble 421 (948): *hylle* (1). Kemble 1290

(995): *cȳð* (1); *-drȳðe* (1); *-gȳðe* (2); *gebyreð* (1); *Mylen-* (1); *-byrig* (1); *-hylle* (3).

13th cent. Sar. Reg. *Hull* (4); *-hulle* (5); *-bury* (10); *Putte-* (3); *-hurst* (1); *Rug-* (1). — *-biri* (26); *-minstr* (2); *-brigg* (1); *-rigg* (2). — *Herst* (1); *-berie* (4).

14th cent. Malm. Reg. *Lutle* (24); *Hull-* (9); *-hulle* (87); *-buri* (7); *-putte* (9); *Mule-* (8); *-hurste* (12); *Gulden-* (1); *Munchene-* (1); *-brugg* (11); *-rugge* (15). — *Little-* (8); *Brig-* (1); *-brigge* (27); *-rigge* (18). — *-beri* (4); *-elle* (1).

§ 150. Somerset. 10th cent. Birch 903 (955): *pyt-* (2); *byrig* (2); *mynster* (1). — *risc-* (1); *hricges* (1).

13th cent. Bath Cart. Linc. M.S. *-hull* (1); *-buri* (14); *Mul-* (3); *-putte* (5); *Huthe* (2); *Lutle-* (1); *Brug* (5); *-brugg* (4); *Ruge* (2). — *-byrie* (2); *Gilden-* (1); *Pitte* (1); *Little-* (3); *-rigg* (1); *-brigg* (4). — *-beri* (1); *-menstr'* (2).

14th cent. Bath Cart. Linc. M.S. *Hulle* (4); *-hulle* (12); *-bury* (27); *Mule-* (3); *-mull* (2); *Hurne* (4); *Put-* (1); *-munstr* (1); *Brug-* (5); *-brugg* (5); *rugg* (3). — *-byr* (1); *Lytel-* (4); *Brigg-* (1); *-brygg* (3); *Rygg-* (1); *-rigge* (6). — *Mele-* (2). Mon. Sec. Ind. *-buri* (25); *-hull* (7); *-putte* (2); *Hurste* (1); *Mulle-* (2); *Brugg-* (1).

§ 151. Devonshire. 10th cent. Napier IV (930): *wyrt-* (4); *-brycge* (1). Kemble 369 (937); *gebyrað* (1); *-hyrste* (2). — *hirnan* (1); *hricges* (2). Birch 723 (938): *hrycg* (2). Kemble 371 (938): *hrycg* (1); — *hric-* (1). Birch 1103 (963); *ðyfel* (1); *pytt* (1); *þyrnan* (1). Kemble 534 (967): *litlan* (1). — *lytlan* (1). Birch 1303 (974): *risc-* (2). Napier II: *pyt* (4); *-byrig* (1); *-brycg* (2); *-hrycg* (10). — *risc-* (2). Napier X (1008—1012); *mynstre* (1).

13th cent. Reg. Bron. *-buri* (1); *-hulle* (3). — *-byri* (9). — *-helle* (1); *-bery* (4); *-pette* (1). Tax. Exon. *-buri* (2); *-putte* (1). — *-biry* (9); *-hille* (3); *-pytte* (2); *Brig-* (1); *-brigge* (1); *Ryg-* (1); *-rigge* (5).

14th cent. Cal. Inq. *-mulne* (1); *-hull* (2); *-rugg* (1); *-brugg* (1). — *-hull* (1); *-biry* (2); *-rigg* (4). Leigh Reg. *-hull* (7); *-put* (1); *put-* (1); *-bury* (1). — *-hill* (2); *-biry* (2); *-rigge* (4). — *-hers* (4).

§ 152. Conclusion. In this effort to define more accurately the geographical boundaries of a few of the more important phonological features of M.E. dialects, I have not attempted to discuss the place of origin of the numerous M.E. literary texts, the homes of which still remain points of dispute. In order to be prepared for such a task, one requires a more precise knowledge of the distribution of many more dialect features — phonological and inflexional — than are here dealt with, and the investigation necessary for the attainment of such knowledge has been carried out for a comparatively small part of the country only — the South-east Midlands. When we are in a position to state definitely wherein lay the resemblances and the differences between each county and its neighbour, we shall be able to solve many of the problems which now raise mountains in the path of the student of Middle English.

Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford.

MARY S. SERJEANTSON.

Notes and News.

Editorial. The following articles and reviews are among those to be published in *English Studies* in the course of next year:

Willem van Doorn, Walter de la Mare.

Id., A Pageant of Recent English Poetry.

Id., Laurence Binyon as Poet.

Frits Hopman, Notes on Macaulay.

Prof. F. Holthausen, An Etymological Dictionary of Modern English,
by Ernest Weekley.

H. Poutsma, De to Hovedarter av Grammattiske Forbindelser,
by Otto Jespersen.

English Association in Holland. The Association is continuing its work of organising lectures by English (and other) men of letters and scholars. In October, the Shelley Centenary lectures were delivered by Prof. C. H. Herford, at Groningen, Amsterdam, Utrecht, Leiden and Rotterdam, and by Mr. Lascelles Abercrombie, at Hilversum, Nijmegen, Haarlem, Arnhem and The Hague. In the latter part of November, Mr. Laurence Binyon lectured on *Chinese Painting*, at Amsterdam, Hilversum, Leiden, Nijmegen, Groningen and The Hague, while during the same week Prof. H. D. Gray, of Stanford University, California, addressed the branches at Haarlem, Utrecht, Arnhem (Gen. Ned.-Eng.) and Amsterdam on *Mark Twain*. This series was substituted for that of Mr. St. John Ervine, who was unable to come. In October, Mr. J. Kooistra, of Groningen, gave a series of three Dutch lectures on *Shakespeare* at Nijmegen.

Correspondence intended for the Amsterdam Branch should, until further notice, be addressed to the ass. secretary, Miss A. Haas, Singel 402.

Modern Studies in Germany. We have received two small volumes of a new series that will interest students of English in this country. It is the *Handbuch der Englisch-Amerikanischen Kultur*, herausgegeben von Wilhelm Dibelius. The two parts that have appeared are *Die Englische Wirtschaft* von Prof. Dr. Hermann Levy; and *Das Religiöse Leben in England* von Prof. Dr. Otto Baumgarten. It is not our purpose to discuss these books; a review by an expert will soon appear of the second book. But it seems useful to point to this evidence of a growing conviction that the exclusive study of the language and literature of a people is not satisfactory for 'philologists'. That it is possible for students of English thus to enlarge the field of their study without becoming journalists seems to be shown by the long experience of classical students. But the *Handbuch* of Prof. Dibelius does not, and is not intended to, supply a want that will be felt by students at the beginning of their career: a handbook of moderate compass. Something in this line has already been done with regard to French by English scholars: we refer to the two books on modern and medieval France published by the Cambridge University Press. In announcing the book on Modern France *A Companion to French Studies*, edited by A. Tilley, they say: "This book is intended to be a companion volume to *Medieval France* (25 s. net) and is similar in scope to its predecessor, though nearly twice as long. It contains contributions by twenty-two writers. The aim of these volumes is to present to the reader within a moderate compass a survey of the history (political,

military, naval, and economic), language, literature, and art of Medieval and Modern France. The volumes are the work of thirty-two writers, all experts in their several provinces."

Translation.

The Snowball.

1. It is always snowing now. 2. This morning, when school was let out, the snow was the cause of a bad accident. 3. No sooner were some of the boys out of door than they began to make snowballs with that watery snow, balls as hard and heavy as stones. 4. Several people were passing by on the sidewalk. 5. A gentleman called out: "Take care, you young rascals!" And at the same moment we heard a sharp cry from the other side of the street, and we saw an old man, bareheaded, stagger and cover his face with his hands and beside him stood a boy who kept crying "Help! help!" 6. Immediately a crowd of people came running up from all sides. 7. The man had received a ball straight in his eye. 8. The children scattered and fled like arrows. 9. I was standing in front of a bookseller's shop where my father had gone in, when some boys came running up and interspersed themselves among the others standing round me and pretended to be looking at the things in the shopwindow. 10. They were Garone, Coretti and Garoffi, the stamp-collector. 11. In the meantime a crowd had collected round the old man and a policeman and others ran about asking: "Who did it? Who did it?" and they wanted to see the boys' hands to ascertain if they were still wet with the snow. 12. Garoffi stood next to me — I noticed that he was trembling from head to foot and pale as death. 13. I heard Garone say softly to him: "Come along, own up, it would be mean to let another suffer for it." 14. "But I didn't do it on purpose," answered Garoffi, trembling like a leaf. 15. "No matter, you must own up to it all the same," repeated Garone. 16. "But I haven't the courage." 17. "Come now, pluck up courage, I will go with you." 18. The policemen and the others kept crying more loudly: "Who was it? Who did it? They have blinded him, the wretches!"

19. I was afraid that Garoffi would fall on the ground. 20. "Come on!" said Garone, "I'll defend you," and he seized him by the arm and pushed him forward, supporting him as if he were an invalid. 21. The people saw and understood; many ran up with clenched fists.

Observations. 1. *It is still snowing (keeps on snowing). It is snowing continually.* Note the difference between *continuous* and *continual*. A *continuous* action is one that is uninterrupted as long as it lasts. *Continual* is that which is frequently renewed, though interrupted. A storm of rain is *continuous*; a succession of showers is *continual*; rain regularly recurring for a long period is *constant*.

2. *When the school was over.* The definite article is not used before names of buildings and some other nouns when the use made of them is referred to. Moreover *school is over* has a different meaning from *school is let out*: At the end of the afternoon, school being over and home-work done, the rest of the day becomes free time. (*Daily News*, July 3, 1919). — *A bad accident has happened this morning.* According to Poutsma's *Mood and Tense*

of the English verb, p. 101, "English is wavering between the perfect and the preterite when the epoch mentioned in the sentence or clause is one which contains the moment of speaking, as is the case with that indicated by *to-day*, *to-night*, or one of the many possible combinations with *this*, such as *this morning* (*afternoon, evening, week, month, year*, etc.)." In our sentence the period of time is, however, further defined by the temporal clause *to en de school uitging* (a past event), and the preterite seems decidedly preferable.

3. *Hardly some of the boys were outside when . . .* When a negative word-modifier opens the sentence there should be inversion of subject and predicate, but only when the negation affects the whole sentence, as is the case here. No inversion takes place when the negative word is closely connected with the subject: *Hardly a sound* disturbed the twilight scene. See Kruisinga's *Accidence & Syntax* § 2068 and § 2071. — *The boys were hardly outside when . . .* is right. — *Balls as solid and hard as stones*. Not: *as fast and hard! Making snowballs from this watery snow*. Only when the material is not all used up is *from* used: Wine is made *from* grapes; cider is made *from* apples. Bread is made *from* wheat. — *Sleet* is formed by mixed rain and snow, "fine icy particles, often with rain" (Webster). — *This watery snow*. In Dutch we often use 'die' (or 'dat') where English requires 'this', and not 'that', both demonstratively (to express one's interest) and as a referring pronoun. See Kruisinga *Acc. & Syntax* § 1185 ff and 1192 ff, also Stoffel's *Handleiding* p. 168: How do you explain *this* phenomenon = Hoe verklaar je dat verschijnsel? Compare further Poutsma, II 1 B. p. 895. C. and Translation M. O. 1922, sentence 2, where *that* is impossible. In the present case it would be wrong to use *this*.

4. *Several persons passed (by) on the pavement*. The plural *pavements* in the sense of 'sidewalk' does not seem to occur; at least not a single illustration came to hand.

5. *A gentleman cried* is correct. — *Do be careful, you little monkeys! And just then we heard a cry of pain and we saw an old man who had lost his hat*. — *Reel* — *Stagger* — *Totter* have in common the idea of an involuntary unsteadiness, a movement towards falling. Only animate beings *reel* or *stagger*, a tower or other erect object may *totter*. *Reel* suggests dizziness or other loss of balance, *stagger* suggests a burden too great to be carried steadily, or a walk such as one would have in carrying such a burden; *totter* suggests weakness: one *reels* upon being struck on the head; a drunken man, a wounded man *staggers*, the infant and the very aged *totter*. (*Century Dictionary*, i.v. *Reel*). — *Piercing cry* = doordringende kreet. Also *ear-piercing*: Uplifting his voice in a series of ear-piercing wails (said of a dog: *Royal Magazine*, May 1905. p. 51.). — *Cover up his face* = to wrap up so as to conceal (N.E.D.) = Du. toedekken. See Observation 12 on page 117 and compare Kruisinga's *Accidence and Syntax* § 238. *Hide (Bury) his face in his hands* is correct: Hides her face in her hands (Oscar Wilde, *Lady Windermere's Fan*, Act. III). Sinks down and buries his face in his hands (*Id.*, p. 39). Note that the definite article in Dutch is rendered by a possessive pronoun in English.

6. Observe the difference in meaning between *at once* (= immediately) and *all at once* (= suddenly).

7. *The man had been struck by a ball in the eye. In not into his eye*. It is rather difficult to give a hard and fast rule for the proper use of *in* and *into* as usage varies a good deal. We *fly in(to) a passion*, but *fall in (not into!) love*. A person is sunk *in* despair, but a matter sinks *into* insignificance. Throw dust *in* a person's eye (in a figurative sense), dust

into a person's eye (in a literal sense). Things that get *in* our eye (specks of dust etc., vide *Strand Magazine*, 1905 p. 381.). The angry look came again *in* his eye (*Idem*, May 1899, p. 592) Voluntarily throwing it *in* the sea (Moulton, *Shakespeare as a dramatic artist*, 45). When several stories came to be combined *in* one there is a danger of the stage being crowded with characters (*Id.* p. 75.). Combine each of the following groups of sentences *into* a simple, a complex or a compound sentence (Maxwell, *English Grammar.*). After *put*, *thrust* and verbs of like meaning both *in* and *into* are met with. Originally *in* was also used to express a motion which results in the position expressed by *in*, and the preposition has maintained itself in a number of cases. Compare *on* and *on to*.

8. *The children scattered in all directions.*

9. *I stood in front of the bookseller's shop.* The periphrastic form is required because the time of action is defined by the clause beginning *when some boys...* *Bookshop* is good English.. *I was standing before the bookseller's.* The word 'shop', 'house', 'church' etc. must not be omitted after the genitive when ambiguity may arise. It would be wrong to say: The bookseller's is opposite the church. My uncle's has been sold. Where is St. Mary's? — A *stationer* differs from a *bookseller* in that he deals in writing-materials, office-requisites and the like. Stationery = *kantoorboekhandel*. — *Mixed with those around me* is correct. — *Made as if they were looking.* — *The window-dressing* has another meaning: The art of window-dressing is carried to a much higher degree in Germany and Austria than in this country... Many of the shop-keepers employed special artists to design the arrangement of the shop windows (Leliveld, *Vertaaloefeningen*, XXVI): *kunst van etaleeren*. The windows are always so tastefully dressed (Lloyd, *Northern English*, p. 116.). There was a milliner's window with a show of nothing but fashionable plush-and-feather hats (Morrison, *Tales of Mean Streets*, I.). A tobacconist's brilliantly lighted window (*Strand Magazine*, June 1904. 699.). *Show-case* = vitrine, an enclosure of which all or some of the sides are of glass, intended to keep small and delicate or valuable objects from dust or injury in a museum or place of sale. —

10. *It was Garone, Coretti and Garoffi.* Dutch *het* refers back and should therefore be rendered by *they*, not by *it*. — *Garoffi of the postage-stamps* is correct. — *Stamp-fancier* is unusual, *dog-fancier* (*hondenkoopman*), *bird-fancier*, *rose-fancier*.

11. *Meanwhile.* — *A circle was formed* = een kring werd gevormd; *had been formed* would suggest an agent. A *ring* belongs to the language of sportsmen, more especially pugilists. Rulings of the *Ring*: Some of the curious incidents that have cropped up in the sport of boxing. (*Pearson's Mag.*, May 1912, p. 514.). "You wouldn't know anything about the *ring*, then?" "Why, the enclosures (*Twenty-five Years in Seventeen Prisons.*). Gave Mrs. W. the go-by in the *Ring* (*Vanity Fair*, p. 424.). "A fight, a fight!" exclaimed the crowd in a burst of pleasure and some called for "a ring". (D. Jerrold, *Men of Character*, I 227.). — *Moved about.* — *Who has done it?* The perfect present is not absolutely wrong, though the preterite sounds more natural. — *Wanted to look at the boy's hands to see if...* is correct. — *Wet from the snow.* The correct preposition is *with*. The grass is *wet with* dew. (Mrs. De la Pasture, *Grey Knight*, 6.) His fetters were *wet with* his tears. (Stead's school edition of Chaucer, p. 14.)

12. *Garoffi was beside me.* — *Deadly (deathly) pale.* — *Death-pale* occurs in Tennyson: Death-pale, for lack of gentle maiden's aid (*Lancelot and Elaine*). She neither blush'd nor shook, but deathly pale Stood grasping what was nearest (*Ibidem*).

13. *I heard Garone whisper to him. — Come and give yourself up. — Tell that you have done it.* Tell is always followed by a nominal or pronominal object, not by an objective that-clause. *It would be base to have another suffer for it. To have* followed by an object + infinitive without to either expresses 'to cause' or 'to experience', not 'let'. See Kruisinga, § 359 & § 361. *To let in another boy for it.* The Oxford Dictionary defines: to involve in the performance, payment etc. of. An old sea-captain, who was once let in for it pretty deep by a man with a broader brim than usual (Haliburton, *Clockm.* Ser. 1 VI.). He had lost all his money. He had been speculating and had been let in by a man. (*Times Weekly Edition*, Jan. 9, 1920.). The phrase seems to be equivalent to our beetnemen, er voor laten opdraaien. Compare: We are in for a pretty storm, a speech. I am in for it now, over Head and Ears, I doubt, and can't help loving him. (Richardson, *Pamela*). N. E. D. comments: certain to meet with punishment or something unpleasant.

14. The preterite is usual in cases like the one under discussion. "Who's that kicking me under the table? It's you, Charles. I know your heavy boots." "I didn't do it on purpose." (Sweet).

15. *That doesn't matter. — Trembling as a leaf.* As should be employed to mark identity.

16. *I have not the courage* (O. Wilde, *Lady Windermere's Fan*, Act. II.). *I haven't got the nerve.*

17. *I go with you. I shall go with you.* Both wrong. The appropriate verb is *will* in all cases where an intention must be expressed. Compare sentence 20: *I will defend you. — Take courage. — I will be with you* is correct.

18. *Bystanders.* The Oxford Dictionary defines the word as a 'passive spectator'.

19. *Sink to the ground* is right.

20. *I will stick up for you. — An ill person. Ill* (Du. ziek) is used predicatively, sick attributively. The child is ill. A sick child. Compare: The boy is small. A little boy.

21. *People* without the article would be equivalent to Dutch men. — *Closed fists* conveys a different notion.

Good translations were received from Miss B. M. C., Tilburg; Miss A. H., Flushing; Mr. R. v. d. M., Hengelo; Miss R. C. O., Arnhem; Miss A. J. E. S., Gorleston-on-Sea; Mr. W. P. J. S., Zwolle; Mr. B. de W., Moordrecht; Mr. H. v. d. W. Steenwijk.

Translations of the following text should be sent before Jan. 1st to P. J. H. O. Schut, c/o Mr. P. J. v. d. Reyden, Voorstraat, Brielle. They will be returned with corrections if accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope.

Ik was de jongste van een groot, rumoerig huisgezin, maar was stil en eenzelvig. En het verbaast me nu dat ik zoo was. Ik was een week, zacht kind; mijn zusters waren al dames — ten minste, ik zag ze zoo; mijn broers waren groote jongens — ten minste ik vond ze héél groot, en ik zelf, heel beneden onder hen, kon niet anders dan week en zacht zijn, hoewel ik niet was onderdrukt. Mijn vader bleef steeds wat ver van mij; maar mijn moeder was heel lief; ik was bij haar als een kuiken onder de vlerken der kloek. Ik was veilig en warm bij haar en ik had haar heel lief, omdat ik zeker was, dat zij mij altijd voor alles beschermen zou.

Want ik was een bang kind; ik was bang voor donkere trappen, voor baardige mannen, voor moordenaars en voor tijgers vooral, en heel bang voor spoken. Voor dat alles, was ik zeker, dat mijn moeder mij zou beschermen; maar ik was niet altijd bij haar; ik speelde op de kinderkamer, en de kindermeid zat aan het raam te verstellen, en hoewel zij wel vriendelijk was, verlangde ik soms naar mijn moeder.

Het is vreemd, maar ik heb dat verlangen altijd gehouden, en soms verlang ik nog naar haar. En toen zij stierf en ik al een man en getrouwd was, is het mij geweest, als of er een bescherming uit mijn leven verdween.

Nu vond ik het soms wel prettig bang te zijn, en maakte mij verhalen van heel groote tijgers en baardige moordenaars; de laatste vooral waren mijn stadige vrees, en ik herinner mij nog de koude rilling die mij overviel, toen mijn nichtje mij eens vroeg:

„Waar ben je meer bang voor, zeg.... voor dieven.... of voor moordenaars?”

Toen heb ik, uit den grond van mijn bevend hart gestamd: „O.... voor moordenaars.... want die.... die maken je dood.” Want bang voor den dood was ik ook. En eens, dat ik den dood bijna zag, ben ik zoo geschrokken, dat ik het nooit zal vergeten. Wij woonden in den Haag, op de Mauritskade, over de brug, die naar de Nassaulaan voert. Het was winter, de gracht was bevroren, en een schaatsenrijder zakte, terwijl ik voor het raam zat mijn kousjes aan te trekken — witte kousjes met roode streepen — door het ijs, onder de brug en werd levenloos, bezwijmd in alle gevallen, er uitgehaald.... Van mijn venster zag ik dat bleeke, natte lijk, met slappe armen en druipharen en gesloten oogen, en vond het zoo verschrikkelijk, dat ik, één kousje aan, naar mijn moeder strompelde, de trap af, naar den salon, en in haar schoot uitbarstte in onbedwingbare snikken.... doodsbang en kilvoud, omdat ik den Dood had gezien.

Reviews.

Giovanni Florio, Un apôtre de la Renaissance en Angleterre à l'époque de Shakespeare. Par LONGWORTH CHAMBRUN. Payot, Paris, 1921. 20 fr. —

The English have always had the reputation of not liking to learn foreign languages; conscious of the power and richness of their own, they travel about the world. This was already the opinion of Giovanni Florio, the Italian teacher of the English Renaissance, and in expressing this opinion he appears to vindicate the same right for the Italian and French tongues, saying in his “First Fruits” (an English-Italian conversation-book): “Whate thinke you of the maners of English men? — I will tell you, some are well manered, but many yl — Toward whom are they yl manered? — Toward Strangers: and fewe of these English men delight to have their children learne divers languages whiche thing displeaseth me. When I arriued first in London, I coulede not speake Englishe, and I met about five handred persons, afore I could find one that could tel me in Italian or French, where the Post dwelt.”

Giovanni Florio was most likely born in England of an Italian father, Michel-Agnelo Florio, a protestant preacher, who under the reign of queen Mary had to look for another refuge. Giovanni probably passed his youth and had his education in Italy and France. In 1578 we find him returned to England as a private teacher of French and Italian at Magdalen College, Oxford.

In 1589 he entered into the service of Henry Wriothesley, lord Southampton, who in the same year left Oxford as an M. A. and began his career of protector of arts and science. To him Shakespeare dedicated, in 1593, his *Venus and Adonis* and the following year his *Lucrece*. Nash, Barnes, Barnfield, Chapman and Daniel assembled at the court of this Maecenas. Being especially a linguist and a grammarian, Florio was an enthusiastic propagator of the Italian language and literature in England, and found in the young lord Southampton a fervent disciple, who soon took a first place among the English Italophiles of his days.

Under James I Florio was removed to the service of the king in the

function of teacher of languages to the Prince of Wales and private secretary and reader to the queen.

His principal works were two collections of English-Italian dialogues, proverbs etc., in the two languages, his *First fruits* (1578) and *Second frutes* (1591). Next he wrote a, for his time perfect, Italian-English Dictionary: *Queen Anna's New world of words*, printed by Bradwood for Edward Blount and Wm. Berret, London 1611. This was the second, "newly much augmented" edition; the first was issued in 1598. Further he gave a valuable translation of Montaigne's *Essais*.

I will here give the beginning of the contents of his *First fruits*.

"*Englishe familiar Speeches*. To speake with a Gentleman, a gentlewoman, a marchant, a domestic.

Amourous Talke. To speake of England — To talke in the darke.

Divers sentences divine and profane. Three hyndred fyne proverbes. Fine sayings, pretty demands. The Abuses of the world.

Discourses upon Peace, Ware, envy, pride, beautie, nobilitie, poverty.

A necessary prayer and which be the goodes of Fortune.

Of wrath with certain fyne sayings of Ariosto and Other Poets, and what the profit of reading and learning of Science is, with certayne discourses in prayse of writers and philosophers.

Reasonings upon Diligence, Humanitie, Clemencie, Temperance and Sobrietie." etc.

It may surprise the reader of Mme Chambrun's book that the author has not considered it her duty to determine the general influence on the Renaissance, in all directions of English literature and philology, of a man who did so much for the spread of Italian culture in England. She has restricted herself to the relations between Shakespeare and Florio and attempted to prove that Shakespeare knew the Italian language, literature and civilisation through the intermediary of Florio. It is just possible that Shakespeare learned much from the books of Florio, especially the Italian language, but Mme Chambrun's arguments for Shakespeare's profound study of the works, so that he enriched his own language and ideas by it, are not very convincing. I have been obliged to put many notes of interrogation in Mme Chambrun's chapter *Les concordances*.

Thus, for instance, in Florio's *Firsi Fruits* we read the proverb "When the cat is abroad the mice play." Shakespeare writes in *Henry IV* act. I sc. 2: "Playing the mouse in absence of the cat." Mme Chambrun supposes that S. took this expression from Florio. So Florio: "Make of necessity virtue" and Shakespeare in the *Two Gentlemen*: "Make a virtue of necessity." Item Florio: "Necessity hath no law," Shakespeare: "Nature must obey necessity." Florio: "A gallant death doth honour a whole life," Shakespeare: "Nothing in life became him like the leaving of it." Florio: "The end maketh all men equal"; Shakespeare: "One touch of nature makes the whole world kin."

Mme Chambrun says: "Peut-être ces proverbes paraîtront-ils au lecteur d'aujourd'hui vieux comme le monde, mais n'oublions pas que Florio affirme à plusieurs reprises, être le premier à les vulgariser en Angleterre, comme il a été le premier aussi à les avoir fait imprimer." The author must permit me not to accept Florio as an authority in this matter. Mme Chambrun should have proved that most likely such proverbs and expressions did not exist in the English vocabulary before Florio wrote his conversation-books. And even then nobody shall make me believe that Shakespeare could not have written the sentence: "One touch of nature makes the whole world kin," unless he had read something of the kind in Florio's *First Fruits*.

Another instance: Florio has in his *Second Frutes*:

Women are the purgatory of men's purses;
The paradise of men's bodies; the hell of men's souls.
Women are in churches saints; abroad angels; at home devils
At windows serens; at doors pyes and in gardens goats.

In Othello we find this about women:

You are pictures out of doors,
Bells in your parlours; wild cats in your kitchens;
Saints in your injuries; devils being offended;
Players in your housewifery and housewives in your beds.

In the Montaigne-translation we read:

Our religion hath no surer foundation than the contempt of life. Since we are threatened by so many kinds of death there is no more inconvenience to fear them all than to endure one. What matter when it cometh since it is unavoidable?

In Julius Caesar:

Cowards die many times before their deaths,
The valiant never taste of death but once.
Of all the wonders that I yet have heard,
If seems to me most strange that men should fear,
Seeing that Death, a necessary end,
Will come when it will come.

Had not the genius of Shakespeare inventiveness enough to imagine this himself, did he want the inspiration from Florio? Indeed I believe he was rich enough to pay such sayings out of his own purse. At any rate he was very ungrateful to his great model by ridiculing him in the shape of Holophernes in *Love's Labours lost*.

J. PRINSEN JLz.

An Essay towards a Theory of Art. By LASCELLES ABERCROMBIE.
London: Martin Secker, 1922. 5/—.

Byron, following the illustrious example of Epimenides the Cretan, once declared that poets are liars (See the eighty-seventh stanza of the third Canto of *Don Juan*), and the verdict has much to recommend itself. Not as regards poems. A good poem is always sincere; it is — besides other things — the true record of an actual experience, no matter to what extent the poet's imagination has modified the real occurrence to which the poem could be ultimately traced. But we are likely to be sadly fobbed off when we approach a poet asking him about the genesis of his work. Knowing the extravagant and fantastic ideas which many outsiders entertain about the nature of inspiration — this word to be pronounced with one's eyes glued upon the ceiling — he fools his questioners to the top of their bent. But the fault lies by no means entirely with the latter, since they have been spoiled by well-known fanfaronades about 'dashing off one's lines in a hurry, in spare moments,' and 'never blotting a line,' and so forth. It seems a vicious circle, from which no escape is possible, unless poets cease from swaggering and the reading public give up their pet notion that, because William Blake considered himself free of the world of fairies and spirits, this must likewise be the case with any poet worthy of the name.

I do not think that Mr. Abercrombie, though a poet, has often been guilty of striking a swaggering attitude. Certain it is that no such attitude is discernible in the present *Essay*. Certain it is that he does not consider poets, as a class, race, or genus apart, either from their fellow-men or from other

artists, painters, sculptors, musicians, etc. And he inscribes his book to lovers of truth. Where should he find them if not in the ranks of students of literature?

If poetry is an art, it follows that a poet must study his art, and, serving his apprenticeship, acquire literary skill, since no angel, devil or fairy will ever perch upon his shoulder, whispering in his ear what he has merely to take down from dictation. It follows also that the act of poetic creation admits of scientific analysis, though allowance must always be made for a residue which, being the product of unconscious or subconscious forces, is no further analysable and must be taken for granted. And it is obvious, inversely, that what applies to poets should equally apply to painters and other artists.

Mr. Abercrombie's starting-point in theorising being aesthetic experience, his book is non-historical, so that it leaves room for another by which it should be supplemented. Can we ever attain to a right appreciation of art, if we close our eyes to its lowly origins in what was primarily intended for *use*, for the satisfaction of man's immediate, physical wants? Did not the temple develop out of the rude shelter man first built himself? Did not the caveman in drawing the image of a bison on a rock, as often as not in a secluded, hardly accessible place, thereby attempt to capture some live bison's soul, in order to ensure successful hunting the next day? Were not dancing, singing, making poetry, practised, from the first, for utilitarian reasons? — But as centuries and centuries rolled on, these things suffered a change, i.e. they came to be looked upon with different eyes, one individual after another realizing, like Angus in Yeats's poem, that the little trout fit only to be cooked and eaten was really a glimmering girl with apple-blossom in her hair.

It seems to me that by ignoring this side of the question Mr. Abercrombie has injured the cogency of his arguments. What he says of a fine locomotive (page 37), that 'it is wholly designed to a practical end,' that 'its existence is to be justified by its achievement of that end, and that 'a locomotive is therefore not a work of art,' would with equal force apply to a vase, a church, a piece of religious sculpture. Yet we would not banish ancient pottery from our museums, and we would maintain that these old-world potters, ignorant of aesthetics and, perhaps, thoughtless of artistry, were nevertheless artists. — Was it an aesthetic experience that in the case of Bunyan prompted the writing of 'A Pilgrim's Progress', one of the few literary allegories that are really masterpieces? Surely the impulse to it was ethical, a thing which I would not venture to affirm so stoutly as regards Lucretius, though here, too, there were powerful ethical motives. And what about the well-known fact that an artist may be *oppressed* by some painful experience, and cannot get rid of what he has 'on the brain' except by converting the oppressive image into a work of art, which alone renders purely aesthetic enjoyment possible?

According to Mr. Abercrombie (page 43) the difficult part of our business lies in the prolegomena. But now it is strange that, whereas I often disagree about these prolegomena, my objections grow more and more infrequent as I read on. I assent when I read: (page 44) '*art is always purposive; the experience in which it originates must be collected into one continuous act deliberately willed, the purpose of it being nothing but to transform the experience into expression.*' I assent when he considers expression in art to be synonymous with communication, and when he asserts, '*There is no such thing as a private work of art: all art is public property.*' I assent most emphatically

on finding it stated (page 93) that '*the value of the poem is not merely in its inspiration, but in its art*,' which disposes of most of the work of a poetess Mr. Abercrombie has never read, viz. of Henriette Roland Holst.

Being called upon to give my final verdict, I would say, the book as a whole is eminently worth reading and studying, the provocative prolegomena because they set one 'thinking furiously', the other chapters because of our *æsthetic* enjoyment when we see how neatly the author hits nail after nail on the head.

WILLEM VAN DOORN.

The Chapbook.

Numbers 22 and 23 were lying on my desk waiting for a review, when the postman delivered number 24, containing besides a 'List of 101 Commendable Plays' for the use of 'Community Theatres, Schools & Dramatic Groups in Town & Country', an announcement to the effect that the publication of the Chapbook would be suspended for six months. Mr. Harold Monro hoped that by the end of that period the cost of book-production would have sufficiently decreased to enable him to publish further issues at the original price of one shilling. As a matter of fact the projected holiday extended over one month more, and number 25 — 'Twelve New Poems by Contemporary Poets' — was brought out in February 1923. Two are by William H. Davies, and they are neither better nor worse than the poems we have been accustomed for years to expect from him. 'The Spell', by John Macleod, might have been a good, whimsical poem for children, but as it is it falls between two stools. 'Love's Hour', by W. B. Livermore, was obviously inspired — oh, dear! — by J. C. Squire's *Behind the Lines*, which I quoted last year in Vol. III, No. 4, page 121. 'In Memory', by M. Hughes, gives tame expression to a rather old notion. 'The Rambling Sailor', by Charlotte Mew, is forcible and striking, but why that unconvincing 'dialect'?

'Ryton Firs' (a fragment) by Lascelles Abercrombie, makes us wish for the whole. And 'When You Are Out', by S. Matthewman, would be the best of the whole batch, if it were not for the unfortunate word *rot*, which is far too violent for its setting.

No. 26, bringing more poems, appeared in May. I have tried, honestly tried, to read Mr. Sacheverell Sitwell's contribution. I have felt my poor brains give way under the strain. Give me a real roundabout, I say, then I shall know, not where I stand, but where I whirl. Are these elaborate hoaxes poetry? Is this the way to interest a distrustful and lukewarm public in imaginative literature? Damn the fellow up and down! Lock him up in a cell! It needn't be a padded one....

Mr. Monro complains, in his Editor's Notes, that '*There is not sufficient talent; there is not enough printworthy new material....*' By including that precious 'Italian Air' — should not Signor Mussolini take action? — he has proved his assertion up to the hilt.

Life being the great humourist, it is small matter for wonder that No. 27 should contain 'about' twenty-seven answers to the following questions:

1. Do you think that poetry is a necessity to modern man?
2. What in modern life is the particular function of poetry as distinguished from other kinds of literature?
3. Do you think there is any chance of verse being eventually displaced by prose, as narrative poetry apparently is being by the novel, and ballads already have been by newspaper reports?

I am not going to answer these questions here, my standpoint being that of Professor Gilbert Murray, who wrote a postcard to state that 'Such questions are for the leisured classes, not for overworked professors'. I must also decline to give a compendium of the exceedingly various answers given and duly or unduly printed. But I wish to join issue with the Editorial statement in the 'Introductory Apology', to the effect that *poetry is not more popular because most of it is worthless*. Is not most 'prose' equally worthless? And do we not see again and again that positively worthless books, Tarzan stories, Pimpernel adventures, 'novels' by Charles Garvice and Ethel Dell, sell like hot cakes? — And again, are not poems of the Ella Wheeler Wilcox type as popular as can be? — Seek other cause 'gainst Roderick Dhu.

No. 28. More poems. No piece of Sitwellian lunacy this time. Rather much to be thankful for. I quote from Humbert Wolfe's 'Kensington Gardens':

THRUSHES.

The City financier
walks in the Gardens
stiffly because of
his pride and his burdens.

The daisies looking
up observe
only a self -
respecting curve.

The thrushes only
see a flat
table-land
of shining hat.

He looks importantly
about him,
while all the spring
goes on without him.

No. 29, September 1922, gives us a good article by Richard Aldington *On the Poet and his Age*. It seems a pity that it should be followed by a piece of Sitwellian slapdash — this time it is not Sacheverell but Osbert who is the offender — directed against Mr. J. C. Squire — Jack Squire, for short — alias Solomon Eagle, and his henchman, Mr. Edward Shanks. While granting that the great influence and power of the Editor of the 'London Mercury' may prove a great danger to English literature, I hold that he will be perfectly immune to the venom contained in this rotten bad doggerel.

No. 30. Poems again. Little that asks for comment. What sort of ear Margaret Drew has for Flintian *cadences* I cannot imagine. H. H. Abbot's contributions may be parodies; if they are not he may turn to certain well-known passages in Browning's *Saul*, and ask himself whether — after this wine — he can only offer us pop to swallow. The volume is saved by a little poem for which we have again to thank Humbert Wolfe:

Said this poet to that poet
"What do you lack?"
Said that poet to this poet
"Friend, scratch my back!"

Said this poet to that poet
"What if I do?"
Said that poet to this poet
"I will scratch you."

W. v. D.

Bibliography.

POETRY, FICTION, DRAMA.

An Anglo-Saxon Verse Book. By W. J. SEDGEFIELD. $8 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, viii + 248 pp. Manchester: University Press; London: Longmans, 1922. 9s. 6d. net.

The Owl and the Nightingale. Edited, with introduction, texts, notes, translation, and glossary, by J. W. H. ATKINS. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6$, xci. + 231 pp. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1922. 16s. n.

Select Early English Poems. Edited by SIR ISRAEL GOLLANCZ. IV., St. Erkenwald. Oxford University Press. London: Milford, 1922. 5s. net.

The Prioress's Tale. The Tale of Sir Thopas (Chaucer). Edited by LILIAN WINSTANLEY, Lecturer in English in the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth. $7 \times 4\frac{3}{4}$, lxxxvi. + 31 pp. Cambridge: University Press, 1922. 3s. 6d. net.

Miss Winstanley's Introduction runs to seventy-seven pages and in the part devoted to Sir Thopas she has particularly devoted much study to tracing the relation between the poetry of Chaucer and the historical and social conditions of his age. [T.]

Poems about Birds: From the Middle Ages to the Present Day. Chosen and Edited with an Introduction and Notes by H. J. MASSINGHAM. With a Preface by J. C. SQUIRE, $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, 415 pp. Fisher Unwin. 10s. 6d. net.

A Pepysian Garland. Black-letter broadside ballads of the years 1595–1639. Chiefly from the collection of Samuel Pepys. Edited by HYDER E. ROLLINS. Cambridge University Press, 1922. 21/- net. [A review will appear.]

Trivia: or, The Art of Walking the Streets of London. By JOHN GAY. With introduction and notes by W. H. WILLIAMS. $11\frac{1}{2} \times 8$, xxiv. + 91 pp. D. O'Connor, 1922. 42s. net.

Poems of Shelley. An anthology in commemoration of the poet's death on July 8, 1822. $9 \times 5\frac{3}{4}$, 252 pp. R. Cobden Sanderson. 8s. 6d. net.

AUSTIN DOBSON. *An Anthology of Prose and Verse.* With a foreword by EDMUND GOSSE. $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, xix. + 174 pp. Dent, 1922. 6s. net.

The Golden Book of Modern English Poetry, 1870–1920. Selected and Arranged by THOMAS CALDWELL. With an Introduction by LORD DUNSANY. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, xxviii. + 395 pp. Dent, 1922. 7s. 6d. net.

Later Poems. By W. B. YEATS. $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, xiii. + 363 pp. Macmillan, 1922. 10s. 6d.

A collection of all Mr. W. B. Yeats's poetry not in dramatic form written between his twenty-seventh year (1892) and 1921.

Noel. An Epic in seven cantos. By GILBERT CANNAN. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$, 370 pp. Martin Secker, 1922. 21s. net.

The Ballad of St. Barbara, and other verses. By GILBERT KEITH CHESTERTON. $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, x. + 83 pp. Cecil Palmer, 1922. 7s. 6d. net.

Shorter Lyrics of the Twentieth Century, 1900–1922. Selected, with a foreword by W. H. DAVIES. $7 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$, 192 pp. Poetry Bookshop, 1922. 5s. net.

A Collection of Nursery Rhymes. Embellished by C. LOVAT FRASER for the Poetry Bookshop. New ed. 4th thousand. 2s. 6d. net.

English Verse. Old and New. An Anthology. Edited by G. C. F. MEAD and RUPERT C. CLIFT. $7 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$, xx. + 211 pp. Cambridge University Press, 1922. 6s. net.

Last Poems. By A. E. HOUSMAN. $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, 79 pp. Grant Richards, 1922. 5s. net.

Modern American Poets. Selected by CONRAD AIKEN. $7 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$, xiv. + 344 pp. Martin Secker, 1922. 6s. net.

Love and Freindship. By JANE AUSTEN, and other Early Works. With a preface by G. K. CHESTERTON. 1922. Chatto and Windus. 6s. net.

English Prose. Chosen and arranged by W. PEACOCK. Volume IV., Landor to Holmes; Volume V., Mrs. Gaskell to Henry James. Milford, 1922. 2s. 6d. net each.

The Cathedral. A Novel. By HUGH WALPOLE. $8 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, viii. + 531 pp. Macmillan Company, 1922. 7s. 6d. net.

The Altar Steps. By COMPTON MACKENZIE. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, 363 pp. Cassell, 1922. 7s. 6d. net.

The Comedy of Errors. (The New Shakespeare). $7\frac{1}{4} \times 5$, xxiv. + 127 pp. Cambridge University Press, 1922. 6s. net. [A review will appear.]

The Seven Deadly Sinnes of London. By THOMAS DEKKER. Edited by H. F. B. BRETT-SMITH. (The Percy Reprints.) $8 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, xviii. + 72 pp. Oxford: Blackwell, 1922. 4s. 6d. net.

Polly: An Opera. Being the second part of *The Beggar's Opera*. Written by Mr. GAY. The Foreword by OSWALD DOUGHTY. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, xxiv. + 117 pp. D. O'Connor, 1922. 6 s. n.

The Dramatic Poems of Percy Bysshe Shelley. Arranged in chronological order with a Preface by C. H. HERFORD. $8\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$, xi. + 412 pp. Chatto and Windus, 1922. 12 s. 6 d. n.

Plays in Prose and Verse: Written for an Irish Theatre and Generally with the Help of a Friend. By W. B. YEATS. $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, 447 pp. Macmillan and Co., 1922. 10 s. 6 d. net.

This volume contains all plays of Mr. W. B. Yeats given at the Abbey Theatre, Dublin, except *The Land of Heart's Desire* and *The Countess Cathleen*. "Four Plays for Dancers" are also omitted from this volume.

King Lear's Wife: The Crier by Night; The Riding to Lithend; Midsummer Eve; Laodice and Danae. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, 221 pp.; *Gruach and Britain's Daughter.* $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, 121 pp. Plays by GORDON BOTTOMLEY. Constable. 7 s. 6 d. n. each volume.

The first volume collects for the first time plays published at intervals from 1902 to 1916; the second volume was first published last November.

Hassan: The Story of Hassan of Bagdad and how he came to make the Golden Journey to Samarkand. A Play in Five Acts. By JAMES ELROY FLECKER. Heinemann, 1922. 6 s. net.

For Love of the King. A Burmese Masque. By OSCAR WILDE. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 6$, ix + 39 pp. Methuen, 1922. 8 s. 6 d. net.

The Forcing House: Or, The Cockpit Continued. By ISRAEL ZANGWILL. Tragi-Comedy in Four Acts. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$, 311 pp. Heinemann, 1922. 7 s. 6 d. net.

Plays: Fifth Series. By JOHN GALSWORTHY. (*A Family Man, Loyalties, Windows.*) $7 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, 116 + 118 + 100 pp. Duckworth, 1922.

The Ship. A Play in Three Acts. By ST. JOHN G. ERVINE. Allen and Unwin, 1922. 3 s. 6 d. n.

Four Short Plays. By LASCELLES ABERCROMBIE. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$, 176 pp. Martin Secker, 1922 6 s. net. [See Review.]

Melloney Holtspur. By JOHN MASEFIELD. $6\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, 126 pp. Heinemann, 1922. 6 s. net.

Krindlesyke. By WILFRID GIBSON. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, 140 pp. Macmillan. 6 s. net.

HISTORY OF LITERATURE, CRITICISM.

Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion (1357--1900). By CAROLINE F. E. SPURGEON. Part III. Text, 1851--1900. 152 pp. Part IV. Appendix A. 107 pp. Part V. Appendices B and C. French and German Allusions. 152 pp., 9 \times 6. For the Chaucer Society, Milford and Kegan Paul. 1922.

The Life and Works of John Heywood. By ROBERT W. BOLWELL. $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, xiii. + 188 pp. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Milford, 1922. 10 s. 6 d. net.

Elizabethan Drama. By JANET SPENS. Methuen, 1922. 5/- net. [A review will appear.]

A Life of William Shakespeare. By SIR SIDNEY LEE. Third Edition of the revised version (rewritten and enlarged). $8\frac{1}{4} \times 6$, xlvii. + 776 pp. Murray, 1922. 15 s. net.

Mr. William Shakespeare. Original and early editions of his Quartos and Folios, his Source Books, and those containing contemporary notices. By HENRIETTA C. BARTLETT. New Haven: Yale University Press. London: Milford, 1922. 12 s. 6 d. net.

A Psycho-Analytic Study of Hamlet. By ERNEST JONES. $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$, 98 pp. International Psycho-Analytic Press, 1922.

Reprinted from essays on applied psycho-analysis in the International Psycho-analytical Library.

Macbeth, King Lear, and Contemporary History. Being a study of the relations of the play of *Macbeth* to the personal history of James I, the Darnley murder and the St. Bartholomew Massacre, and also of *King Lear* as symbolic mythology. By LILIAN WINSTANLEY. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, 228 pp. Cambridge University Press, 1922. 15 s. net.

Shakespeare and Music. By CHRISTOPHER WILSON. *The Stage Office*, 1922. 7 s. 6 d.

Shakspeare to Sheridan. By ALWIN THALER. Harvard University Press. London: Milford, 1922. 21 s. net.

The Seventeenth Century Accounts of the Masters of the Revels. By CHARLOTTE CARMICHAEL STOPES. $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6$, 36 pp. For the Shakespeare Association. Milford. 2 s. net.

Dryden as an Adapter of Shakespeare. By ALLARDYCE NICOLL. $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6$, 35 pp. *The Beginnings of the English Secular and Romantic Drama.* By ARTHUR W. REED. $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6$, 31 pp. For the Shakespeare Association: Milford, 1922. 2 s. net each.

Andrew Marvell. 1621--1678. Tercentenary Tributes by ALGUSTINE BIRRELL and others. Edited by W. H. BAGGULEY. Milford, 1922. 6/- net.

Some Contributions to the English Anthology. (With Special Reference to the Seventeenth Century). By JOHN DRINKWATER (Warton Lecturer on English Poetry). $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$, 20 pp. For the British Academy. Milford, 1922. 1s. net.

Samuel Pepys. Administrator, Observer, Gossip. By E. HALLAM MOORHOUSE. $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$, vii.+332 pp. Leonard Parsons. 1922. 6s. n.
First published 1909.

A Dutch source of Robinson Crusoe: The narrative of the El Ho. "Sjouke Gabbes" (also known as Henrich Ixel). An episode from the description of the mighty kingdom of Krinke Kesmes. Et cetera, by Hendrik Smeeks, 1708. Translated from the Dutch and compared with the story of Robinson Crusoe by LUCIUS L. HUBBARD. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$. Iii.+172 pp. Wheldon and Wesley. 1922. 17s. 6d. n. [A review will appear.]

The Beggar's Opera. Its Predecessors and Successors. By FRANK KIDSTON. 7×5 , 109 pp. Cambridge University Press. 5s. n.

Young Boswell: Chapters on James Boswell the Biographer, Based Largely on New Material. By CHAUNCEY BREWSTER TINKER. $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$, 266 pp. Putnams. 1922. 15s. n.

Johnsonian Gleanings. By ALEYN LYELL READE. Part III. The Doctor's Boyhood. $8\frac{3}{4} \times 7$, xi.+209 pp. Author: Treleven House, Blundellsands, near Liverpool. 1922. 21s. to subscribers only.

William Blake and his Poetry. By ALLARDYCE NICOLL. $7 \times 4\frac{3}{4}$, 154 pp. Harrap. 1922. 2s. n.

Keats. A Study in Development. By H. I'A. FAUSSET. Secker, 1922. 7/6 net.

The Life of Hazlitt. By P. P. HOWE. Secker, 1922. 24/- net.

De Quincey as Literary Critic. By J. H. FOWLER. $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$, 18 pp. For the English Association. 1922. 2s. n.

George Gissing: An Appreciation. By MAY YATES. $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$, ix.+109 pp. Manchester: University Press. London: Longmans. 1922. 6s. n.

The Ordeal of Mark Twain. By VAN WYCK BROOKS. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$, vii.+267 pp. Heinemann. 1922. 12s. 6d. n.

La Société Californienne de 1850 d'après Bret Harte. Par A Cécile Réau. Paris, Ollier Henry. 1922.

Un Italien d'Angleterre: le Poète-Peintre Dante Gabriel Rossetti. Par HENRY DUPRÉ. Paris, Dent. 1922. 148 pp. fr. 12.-.

The Outline of H. G. Wells. The superman in the street. By SIDNEY DARK. $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$, 194 pp. Leonard Parsons. 1922. 5s. n.

Some Contemporary Novelists (Men). By R. BRIMLEY JOHNSON. $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$, 221 pp. Leonard Parsons. 1922. 6s. n.

John Masfield. A critical study. By W. H. HAMILTON. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, 155 pp. Allen and Unwin. 1922. 7s. 6d. n.

The Problem of Style. By J. MIDDLETON MURRY. Milford, 1922. 6/6 net.

Countries of the Mind. By J. MIDDLETON MURRY. Collins. 1922. 10s. 6d. net.

James Elroy Flecker: A Appreciation with some Biographical Notes. By DOUGLAS GOLDING. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, vii.+200 pp. Chapman, and Hall. 7s. 6d.

Collected Prose. By JAMES ELROY FLECKER. $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, viii.+269 pp. Heinemann. 1922. 6s. n.

On English Poetry. By ROBERT GRAVES. Heinemann, 1922. 8/6 net. [A review will appear.]

An Anatomy of Poetry. By A. WILLIAMS-ELLIS. Blackwell, 1922. 7/6 net. [A review will appear.]

The Technique of Thomas Hardy. By JOSEPH WARREN BEACH. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, ix.+255 pp. Chicago: University Press. 1922. \$ 2.50.

A Portrait of George Moore in a Study of his Work. By JOHN FREEMAN. $8\frac{3}{4} \times 6$, xi.+283 pp. Werner Laurie. 1922. 16s. n.

Modern English Essays. Edited by ERNEST RHYS. In five volumes, $7 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$. Vol. I. xv.+240 pp. Vol. II. vii.+246 pp. Vol. III. ix.+244 pp. Vol. IV. ix.+245 pp. Vol. V. ix.+245 pp. Dent. 1922. 3s. n. each.

The Trembling of the Veil. By W. B. YEATS. T. Werner Laurie. 1922. 42s. net.

Books Reviewed. By J. C. SQUIRE. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, x.+293 pp. Hodder and Stoughton. 1922, 7s. 6d. n. [A selection of papers and reviews reprinted from the *Observer*.]

Essays at Large. By SOLOMON EAGLE $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, xii.+211 pp. Hodder and Stoughton. 1922. 7s. 6d. n.

Most of these papers by "Solomon Eagle" (Mr. J. C. Squire) are reprinted from the *Outlook*; a few appeared in *Land and Water*.

Soliloquies in England and Later Soliloquies. By GEORGE SANTAYANA. 9×6 , viii.+264 pp. Constable. 12s.

An Essay Towards a Theory of Art. By LASCELLES ABERCROMBIE. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$, 115 pp. Martin Secker. 1922. 5s. n. [See Review.]

Courage. By J. M. BARRIE. (The Rectorial Address delivered at St. Andrews University, May 3, 1922). $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$, 47 pp. Hodder and Stoughton. 1922. 2s. n.

Contemporary American Novelists, 1900—1920. By CARL VAN DOREN. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, xi.+176 pp. Macmillan Company. 7s. n.

LINGUISTICS, HISTORY.

On the History of the English Present Inflections, particularly -th and -s. By ERIK HOLMQUEST. Heidelberg, Winter. 1922. Price for Holland f3.20. [A review will appear.]

A History of Modern Colloquial English. By H. C. WYLD. 2nd ed. Fisher Unwin, 1922. Elaborate subject and word indices have been added; otherwise no alteration has been made.

English Intonation. With systematic exercises. By H. E. PALMER. Heffer, 1922. 5/- net. [A review will appear.]

Social Life in the Days of Piers Plowman. By D. CHADWICK. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6$, xiii.+125 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1922. 10s. 6d. n. [A review will appear.]

Minutes and Accounts of the Corporation of Stratford-upon-Avon and other Records, 1553-1620. Transcribed by RICHARD SAVAGE. With Introduction and Notes by EDGAR I. FRIPP. Volume I., 1553-1566. Oxford. 1922. Printed for the Lugdale Society by Frederick Hall, printer to the University. Member's subscription, one guinea

English Homes. Period V. Vol. I. Early Georgian, 1714-1760. By H. AVRAY TIPPING. Country Life. £3 3s.

The Old Cryes of London. By SIR FREDERICK BRIDGE. Novello. 7s. net.

In Whig Society, 1775-1818. Compiled from the hitherto unpublished correspondence of Elizabeth, Viscountess Melbourne, and Emily Lamb, Countess Cowper, afterwards Viscountess Palmerston. By MABEL COUNTESS OF AIRLIE. $9 \times 5\frac{3}{4}$, xvi.+205 pp. Hodder and Stoughton 15s. n.

Sidelights on Byron.

The Economic History of Ireland from the Union to the Famine. By GEORGE O'BRIEN. Longmans, 1921. 21/- net.

A Short History of British Expansion. By JAMES A. WILLIAMSON. Macmillan 1922. 25s. n.

A Constitutional History of England. By G. B. ADAMS. New York, Holt.

A Short History of the Jews in England. By the REV. H. P. STOKES. S.P.C.K. 5/6 net.

PERIODICALS.

Modern Language Review. XVII, 4. Oct. 1922. Includes: D. Everett. The Middle English Prose Psalter of Richard Rolle of Hampole, II. — H. M. Margoliouth, Andrew Marvell: some biographical points. — W. J. Entwistle, Geoffrey of Monmouth and Spanish literature.

Modern Language Notes. XXXVII, 7. Nov. 1922. Include: A. C. Judson, A forgotten Lovelace M.S. — N. I. White, Shelley's debt to Alma Murray. — W. A. Eddy, Rabelais — a source for *Gulliver's Travels*.

Revue de Littérature Comparée. II, 4. Oct.—Déc. 1922. P. de Nolhac, Un poète rhénan ami de la Pléiade. III. Paul Melissus à Paris (fin). — L. Wittmer, Au temps des bergerades: Gessner et Watelet, d'après des lettres inédites. — P. Martino, *Le Del Romanticismo nelli arti* de Stendhal. — Stendhal, Du Romanticisme dans les beaux-arts. — P. Trahard Cervantes et Mérimée.

Revue des Deux Mondes. Avril-Mai 1922. Includes: Emile Legouis, Le Roman de William Wordsworth.

Revue germanique. XIII, 4. Oct.—Déc. 1922. Includes: G. Roth, Sur les imitations en vers, par Sainte-Beuve, de poèmes anglais. — A. Digeon. Une nouvelle biographie de Fielding. — P. Dhérissart, La poésie anglaise (revue annuelle).

Die Neueren Sprachen. XXX, 7/8 (Aug.-Oct. 1922). Includes: G. Herzfeld, John Sterling. — Notes. — Reviews.